

THE CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. III.—MARCH, 1879.

CALVIN AND THE PSALMODY OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES.

MISS WINKWORTH and others, in recent times, have shown, in a very fresh and vivid manner, how large a part was borne by Christian song and sacred melody in the great religious revival of the sixteenth century. It is unnecessary in this paper to enter at length into the question how far these may have been its cause, and how far its effect, or to seek for any more recondite explanation of the fact than Luther believed he had found, in a passage of the Song of Songs, which, it is now acknowledged, was specially present to his mind when he penned his first hymn on the two martyrs of Christ at Brussels, and wrote his famous letter to the persecuted Christians of Holland, Brabant, and Flanders—

<p>“ Lo the winter is past, The rain is over, is gone, The flowers appear in the land, The time of song is come.”</p>	<p>Thus para- phrased by him :</p>	<p>“ For us, we thank our God therefore, Summer is nigh the doors about, The tender flowers are peeping out ; The winter now is over ; His hand, of all first mover, Stays not till it has finished.”</p>
---	--	---

The set time to favour His inheritance had come. First God revealed Himself in the glory of His grace to an individual soul weighed down by the burden of sin, freed him from his burden, brought him to peace and joy in His salvation, and enabled him, out of the fulness of his heart, to express his gratitude and tell of his experience in strains which, like those of the inspired Psalmist in Psalm 40, went straight to the hearts of many—

“ Captive to Satan once I lay
In inner death forlorn ;
My sins oppressed me night and day—
Therein I had been born :
And deeper fell howe’er I strove,
My life had neither joy nor love,
So sore had sin possessed me.
VOL. I.—NO. III.

“ Then God, in His eternity,
Looked on my boundless woe ;
His deep compassion flowed toward me,
True succour to bestow ;
His father’s heart did yearn and melt
To heal the bitter pains I felt,
Though it should cost His dearest.”
M

The Lord's gracious dealings with him, and the way of salvation disclosed to him, form the subject of this his second hymn, which, after three centuries, Miss Winkworth has once more made popular in our own language. One of his contemporaries did not hesitate to say of it—"Who doubts that many hundred Christians have been brought to the true faith by this one hymn alone, who before, perchance, could not so much as bear to hear of Luther's name; but his sweet and noble words have so taken their hearts that they were won over to the truth?"* And from that time forth the nightingale of Wittenberg sang on, pouring forth notes of sweetest melody, and attracting others, whose hearts God had touched, to join in the song, till Roman Catholics complained that "the whole country was singing itself into the Lutheran doctrine;" and the poetry of the Reformation, wedded to music worthy of it, was treasured in the hearts and homes of the faithful, from the mountains of Switzerland to the shores of the Baltic, and from the banks of the Rhine to those of the Vistula and the Danube. To the treasures of sacred song furnished by recently-awakened Germany were soon added those provided by the older poets of Bohemia, a number of whose hymns, translated into German, were greatly prized in the land of Luther, as some of them, turned into homely Scotch, enjoyed a wide popularity in our native land during the latter half of the sixteenth century.

But both Germans and Bohemians dealt mainly with one element of the old Church song—the hymns and sequences. The psalms so dear to Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, and other Church fathers, and which, in the early ages, formed the true liturgy and hymn-book of the people, were not yet recalled by the new Church to their old place of honour in the services of the sanctuary. They had been continued in a fashion by the Roman Church through the Middle Ages, but in a language not understood, and therefore not appropriated with any heart by the mass of the people. Several of them had been translated into verse by the early Lutheran poets, incorporated into their hymn-books, and set to music similar in character to that of their hymns. A few, generally including the vesper psalms of the old service, had been translated into German prose, and probably were sung to music similar in character to the old ecclesiastical chants. No enthusiasm, however, had been evoked, nor any special place of honour claimed for the book which had been the chief treasury of devotion and praise both to the Jewish and to the early Christian Church; and when at length a full translation of it was prepared, it seems to have been but partially used, and intended rather for the family than for the congregation. Had, then, the new Church outgrown the ancient book of praise? Was it no longer possible to revive the old enthusiasm for the sweet songs of Israel, to kindle the flame of devotion at the old altar fire, and keep it brightly burning with the beaten oil of the sanctuary? Such was the question which still remained to be solved by the Reformed Church, and

* Winkworth's "Christian Singers of Germany," pp. 111, 123.

which Calvin earnestly and resolutely set himself to solve for her. I shall now endeavour, as succinctly as I can, to tell the story of his labours and success in this great enterprise.

From the days of Dean Swift, ludicrous caricatures have been drawn of Master Jack tearing off in hot haste the tawdry ornaments which, in more showy times, had been sewed on to the good coat his father had given him, quite regardless of the piteous rents he made in the garment itself. Condemnation has been expressed in very positive and unmeasured terms of the rash and inconsiderate way in which Calvin is supposed to have acted in removing all the additions which, in the course of ages, had been made to the primitive simplicity of the government and worship of the Church. Such caricatures and denunciations are generally more amusing than spiteful. They have originated far more frequently in ignorance of his history than in intentional misrepresentation of it; and when the significance of certain cardinal facts in this history had failed to impress itself on the minds of his friends, it was in no way surprising that it should have been overlooked by those who had less sympathy with him. One of the most respectable musical authorities of our own times affirms that he "never seems to have recognised music as a means of religious expression, scarcely even to have appreciated it as an aid to devotion."* And an honoured congregationalist, who has done much for the improvement of the service of sacred song among his own people, some time ago maintained that "Calvin was utterly destitute of musical sensibility, as every page of his writings and every element of his character indicate. He was too much of a theological formula to have much of the genius of song. . . . And yet, strange to say, it is to Calvin we owe the introduction of metrical psalmody into the Reformed Churches of France." This would have been strange indeed, had the character of Calvin been such as Dr. Allon represented it to be—strange indeed, that one who "was utterly destitute of musical sensibility" should have felt himself called to lead the way in a movement which speedily extended its electric influence not only to his native France, but to every country where the Reformed Church had gained a foothold; that he should have ventured to put forth his own powers on such a task, should gradually have secured the aid of some of the most gifted poets and the most skilful musicians his native country could boast, and that he should, to so large an extent, have succeeded in moulding the service of praise in all the Reformed Churches, and through the version of Lobwasser, have had accorded to the metres and melodies of his Psalter so large a circulation in Lutheran and musical Germany itself. It is not the fact that he was "utterly destitute of musical sensibility," and "hardly appreciated music as an aid to devotion" in public worship. "Ad

* Hullah, as quoted in *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, vol. xix. p. 784. See also Exeter Hall Lectures to Young Men's Christian Association, vol. xix. p. 304, and Bovet's "*Histoire du Psautier*," p. 17.

poeticen naturâ satis eram propensus"* is his claim in his own behalf, and there is nothing in his history or writings which can warrant us to set it aside. From the outset of his career he recognised the place and power of sacred song in Christian worship. In the first edition of his Institutes, published before he settled at Geneva, while he asserts that neither vocal prayer nor singing is of any value unless proceeding from the deep affection of the heart, he is careful to add that neither the one nor the other is to be condemned, provided they follow the affection of the mind and are subservient to it; and by the reason he briefly assigns, he shows unquestionably that he did recognise both as aids to devotion, *sic enim mentem in Dei cogitatione exercent et INTENTAM RETINENT*.† I may add, though in doing so I anticipate a little the chronological order, that in the preface to his "*Forme des prières et des chants ecclésiastiques*," as published in 1542, he expresses himself still more distinctly on the subject—"As for public prayers, they are of two sorts, the one uttered in words only, the other accompanied with singing. Nor is this a thing invented in recent times, but one which has existed from the first origin of the Church, as appears from the histories. Even St. Paul does not speak of vocal prayer only, but also of singing, and in fact we know by experience that singing has great force and power to move and inflame the hearts of men to invoke and praise God with a more fervent and lively zeal. It is always to be borne in mind, however, that the singing should be free from levity and frivolity, and have, as Augustine says, weight and majesty. And so there is a great difference between the music used for the diversion of men at table and in their houses, and the psalms which are sung in the Church in the presence of God and His angels."‡ This is greatly extended on and earnestly enforced in later editions of the book,§ and, along with passages occurring here and there in his commentaries, might almost suffice to refute the charges which have been brought against him. But as a more detailed statement of the work he did, and the way in which he did it, will thoroughly dispose of these charges, and tend to correct mistakes long prevalent, I trust my readers will excuse my entering into further details, and laying before them the results which seem to have been established by the recent investigations of his countrymen, as to the part he took in moulding the service of praise in the Reformed Churches.

To begin at the beginning, it seems to be an undeniable fact that the process of demolition had been completed at Geneva ere Calvin appeared on the scene at all, and that the work which fell to his lot in the depart-

* Letter to Conrad Hubert, quoted by Baum in his Life of Beza.

† "*Calvini Opera*," vol. i. p. 88. He holds that tongue as well as heart should give its best.

‡ "*Calvini Opera*," vol. vi. pp. 168, 169.

§ In its enlarged form it has been pretty closely followed in the preface to the Book of Common Order of 1556, and is given in Laing's Knox, vol. iv. p. 164.

ments of worship and church government was as distinctively a work of construction as that which fell to him in the department of Christian doctrine. Not only had the bishop and his officials been chased away, and their jurisdiction abolished, but mass, matins, evensong, and other Latin services had been already suppressed in the city, as in many other communities in Switzerland. "When I first came to this Church," he reminded the ministers of Geneva in his farewell address to them, "there was, as it were, nothing done. *There was preaching, but that was all.*" No proper service of prayer and praise in the French tongue had been set up in room of the unintelligible Latin service which had been taken away. The preacher simply prefaced his sermon with a short prayer, probably like the bidding prayer long used in the Church of Zurich,* and concluded with a still briefer form. There was no service of sacred song, and it was not till afterwards that it was generally introduced into Switzerland, especially into Zurich,† whose reformer is credited with much greater poetical and musical talent than Calvin. These facts must be borne in mind ere we can realise the full significance of the statements quoted from the first editions of his Institutes and Form of Prayers. Such statements were testimonies against a practical evil and not mere theoretical assertions of what he deemed expedient and right. The reformer had been but a few months in Geneva, when, in concert with Farel, he presented to the council a long "Memorial on the Organisation of the Church." In this, after pleading for the frequent administration of the Lord's Supper (*tous les dimanches pour le moins, quant l'église est assemblée en multitude*), for the appointment of elders, the exercising of a stricter discipline over the communicant, and the exacting from all a confession of their faith,—they thus ask for the restoration of the service of sacred song: "The other part has reference to the psalms which we desire to be sung in the Church. . . . We cannot conceive the improvement and edification which will come of this till after we have tried it. Certainly, according to our practice, the prayers of the faithful are so cold that it must turn to our great disgrace and confusion. The psalms would stir us up to raise our hearts to God, and move us to fervour in invoking Him and exalting the glory of His name. Besides, by this men would come to know of what benefit and consolation the Pope and his partisans have deprived the Church when they have employed the psalms, which should be true spiritual songs, to be mumbled between them without any understanding of them."‡ It was suggested that a beginning should be made with the children, and that, having been instructed beforehand in some sober ecclesiastical tune, they should be required to sing it in a loud and distinct voice, while the people listened with all

* Lavater, "De Ritibus Ecclesiæ Tigurinæ," p. 28.

† Lavater, Commentary on 1 Chronicles as cited by Bovet, "Nos illas ecclesias in quibus totus cœtus populari linguâ pia carmina cantat, non reprehendimus; ferant ipsi vicissim nos qui non canimus."

‡ Gaberel's "Histoire de l'église de Genève," vol. i., Appendix, pp. 108, 109.

attention and followed mentally what was sung vocally, until by little and little they were trained to the new service. But the real difficulty, M. Douen says, was not to find the tunes and teach them to the people, but to find a rhythmical version of the psalms in French, and that was a difficulty which would have staggered men less resolute and less devoted. The situation of Calvin and Farel was exactly the same as that in which Luther found himself when he wrote to Spalatin in 1524: "I wish to see if there is not among you an Asaph or a Heman, *quærimus undique poetas*." * Nor were they the men to give up the quest prematurely any more than Luther, and possibly even before their banishment from Geneva in April, 1538, they had prosecuted it with some success.

There was another difficulty, however, which, though it is only expressly referred to after their banishment, must have impeded their action for months before. This was occasioned by the efforts of the Bernese to have the worship, discipline, and ecclesiastical customs of the Church of Geneva, and of French Switzerland generally, conformed to their own. The Bernese, like the Zurichers, had not yet introduced the singing of psalms into their worship any more than they had consented to that strict oversight of the communicants for which the Genevese pastors had contended and had suffered. Failing in his every effort to bring the Bernese over to his views, and through them to effect a reconciliation with his former flock, Calvin left Switzerland for a time, and consented to minister to his countrymen settled in one of the cities of Germany. It is not the case, as some have asserted, that he, like J. Wedderburn, and probably like Coverdale, was privileged to sit at the feet of Luther, and, from intercourse with him, acquire fresh enthusiasm in regard to the service of sacred song. There is no fact in his history better ascertained than the fact that Luther and he never met face to face, never directly corresponded with each other, and there is none more to be regretted. But though Wittemberg did not open her gates to him, Strassburg, which, after Wittemberg, had done most for hymnology, acted a more kindly part, and in honouring him and affording him leisure, liberty, and encouragement to carry out his long-cherished purpose, she conferred honour on herself. His actual experience of the blessed effects resulting from the more fully developed service of prayer and praise in the German congregations in the city made him realise more acutely the sad want of it in his own, and urged him on, even amidst the distractions attendant on his first settlement and under the deep poverty in which for a time he was involved, to provide a contribution to his Master's cause which was to make many rich. He drew up forms of prayer founded on those already in use in the German churches of the city, and like them and the other early liturgies of the Reformed Churches, leaving ample room for free prayer. And as the melodies of the German hymns pleased him better than the secular tunes to which the few psalms and hymns then existing

* Douen's "Clement Marôt et le Psautier Huguenot," p. 280: "Everywhere we seek for poets."

in the French language were usually sung, he set himself to turn a few of the psalms into verse in stanzas and measures adapted to the tunes of Greiter and other German composers. Of his liturgy we know only generally that it was drawn up soon after his settlement at Strassburg, but whether it was soon published we do not know. Of the formation of his collection of metrical psalms, to be employed in the service of praise, and of its publication, we have now a very complete and interesting account.

The brief notices of Calvin's progress, scattered through his correspondence and that of his friends, have now been nearly all brought together. The earliest, indeed, has escaped even M. Douen, and it is important as showing that he had set himself at once to meet this felt want of his countrymen. It occurs under date 9th November, 1538, in a letter of Zwick of Constance to Bullinger, at Zurich, communicating to him the intelligence that "a church had been granted to the French in Strassburg, in which they hear sermons from Calvin four times a-week, and also celebrate the Lord's Supper, and sing psalms in their own language." * It may still admit of doubt whether his "Form of Prayers" had yet been drawn up, but it admits of none that even at that early date, or within two months after he came to Strassburg, the singing of French psalms had been introduced into his congregation. There is no reason indeed to suppose that any formal collection of rhymed psalms had as yet been made, much less published. The next notice, however, seems to point in that direction. It occurs more than seven months later, in a postscript to a letter sent by Toussaint of Montbeliard to Calvin, in which he begs his correspondent to send him the French psalms.* A similar request, addressed about a year later by Martin Peyer of Wittemberg to Conrad Hubert of Strassburg, falls to be mentioned next, though it does not come next in chronological order. "I beg specially," he writes, "that you will send me the French hymns or psalms as they are wont to be sung among you, for the preceptor of our Prince is very desirous to obtain them." * There can be no doubt that these two notices imply that a collection of psalms had by that time been drawn up, but had they stood alone, it might still have been an open question whether it was yet published. Two letters written by the reformer himself in the latter part of 1539 to his friend and counsellor Farel seem to determine this point. The first is dated 27th October, 1539, and though preserved in the library at Geneva, seems to have been published for the first time in the new edition of his works. In it Calvin requests his friend to enjoin a certain Michael (who shortly before had returned from Strassburg to Switzerland) to write by the first messenger what has become of the psalms. "I had," he continues, "given orders that a hundred copies should be sent to Geneva. Now I learn for the first time that this has not been done. Certainly he has acted too negligently in delaying so long to inform me." * The reply of Farel has not been preserved, but in the letter addressed to him by

* "*Calvini Opera*," vol. x., pars posterior pp. 288, 357, 426, 428 ; and vol. vi. p. xxii.

Calvin on 19th December of the same year, the reformer once more reverts to the subject, and in terms which, from their connection with the previous letter, we are only now able fully to understand; * he tells him: "We had sent the psalms for the purpose of being first sung among you before they arrived at the place you wot of. For we have resolved soon to publish them. Because the German tunes pleased me better, I have been obliged to try what I could do in verse. So two psalms, the xlvi. and the xxv., are my first tentative efforts; the others I added afterwards." To M. Bovet belongs the honour of first having brought together most of these notices, and having pointed out their significance. At the time his history of the Psalter of the Reformed Churches appeared, misled by a reference to an approaching publication in the letter just quoted, he was still inclined to hold that the hundred copies forwarded to Geneva in the autumn of 1539 were in MS., and that the edition of 1542 was the oldest printed edition of the Reformed Psalter. The editors of the Strassburg edition of the reformer's works were disposed to concur with him. Others of his countrymen, however, took a different view, and to one of them belongs the honour of finally settling the matter at rest. M. Douen, in his great work on Clement Marôt and the Huguenot Psalter, gives the following interesting account of the manner in which this has been brought about:—

"All the *data* regarding the primitive psalter which contemporary science was able to bring together, up to the end of the year 1873, were limited to these five fragments, which might leave room for different hypotheses. Already M. Bovet had published his, and we had formulated another; . . . but nothing could supply the place of the irrecoverable little volume, which, for the sake of peace, we were not thinking of inquiring after any more. It is easy to fancy how we were startled as we read one day among the bibliographical communications that came to us from abroad, these lines:—'Our library contains also a little volume which may perhaps interest you. Its title is *Aulcuns Pseaulmes et Cantiques mys en chant, A Strassburg, 1539.*' Doubt was no longer possible; a copy—most probably the only one—of the first collection of Reformed Church music, of which no French writer, nor even the German specialists in bibliography, had any knowledge, at last was brought to light, and of its own accord had presented itself to us."†

Then after stating that he owed this godsend mainly to the kindness of Julius Jos. Maier, conservator of the liturgical portion of the library of Munich, and giving a brief account of the form and arrangement of the volume, he continues:—

"This little treatise, entirely anonymous, contains eighteen psalms and three sacred songs, in all, twenty-one pieces, each of which has its melody attached to

* M. Douen, following the Strassburg editors, seems to think that even this letter had only appeared twice before our own day—viz., in the Amsterdam edition of Calvin's works, and in the edition of his letters, published at Geneva in 1576. But it appears also in the very common Genevan edition of 1617.

† "Clement Marôt et le Psautier Huguenot," p. 301, 302.

the first verse; but neither preface nor liturgy nor appendices nor the name of the translator nor that of the musician. The psalms are the following in the natural order—1, 2, 3, 15, 19, 25, 32, 36, 46, 51 (numbered 50*), 91, 103, 113, 114, 130, 137, 138, 143; and the songs were those of Simeon, the ten commandments, and the creed. Two of these pieces are not versified. Psalm 113, which is in measured prose, and the creed, the simple prose of which forms only a couplet."

Some curious questions have been raised as to the authors of the poetical versions in this psalter, and as to the way in which those which were not his own composition were obtained by Calvin. We have his testimony that the versions of the 25th and 46th psalms were prepared by himself, and it is now generally agreed that those of the 38th and 91st, and probably the 36th psalms, as well as the metrical translations of the song of Simeon and of the ten commandments, are to be ascribed to him. Psalm 113, as already mentioned, is a prose chant, and the creed seems to be so too. The other twelve metrical psalms, though not given in the exact form in which, three years later, they were published by their author, are undeniably in the the main the work of Clement Marôt, who is acknowledged to have been the greatest French poet of the age, and was with all his failings a warm friend of the new learning, and of the scriptural teaching of the Reformers. Our space does not allow us to discuss the disputed question of Marôt's relations to Calvin, nor to dwell on the changes occurring in the various editions of the psalter that appeared at this time, the most celebrated of which are the Pseudo-Roman or Strassburg edition of 1542, and the Genevan edition, printed at Geneva soon after Calvin's return, and brought to light in 1855 by Wackernagel, who found a copy of it in the library of Stuttgart. In 1542, Marôt, expelled a second time from France, came to Geneva, which several of his fellow-exiles had already reached. "That which struck the French refugees most on arriving there was not the splendour of the lake, nor the gracious majesty of the monarch of the Alps, nor the physiognomy of the reformer, nor the austerity of manners, nor the tyranny of the laws. The singing of the psalms was the great novelty of the epoch. If Beza was deeply impressed by this in 1548, as he has related, the emotion of Marôt must have been much greater still, when his verses, sung with deep feeling to grave music by a numerous assembly, fell on his ear under the vaulted roof of the church of St. Pierre."[†]

Invited by Calvin and his associates to continue the good work which he had begun, and which was already yielding such precious fruits, Marôt not only consented to revise carefully the psalms he had previously translated, but he composed nineteen new ones, copies of which, it is said, he forwarded to the King of France before he allowed them to be printed at Geneva. According to M. Douen, he was delighted with

* As in the Vulgate.

† Douen's "*Clement Marôt et le Psautier*," p. 394.

the music which Calvin had got for his psalms, and he wrote his well-known epistle, *Aux dames de France*, to recommend it to them. Calvin, on his part, showed a very decided preference for his version of the psalms, which could not be but gratifying to Marôt. Withal, however, the city of Geneva, which seemed to Knox and other earnest refugees the most perfect school of Christ since the days of the apostles, by-and-by presented itself to the courtly poet in a less attractive light. M. Douen draws a somewhat sombre picture of the unsatisfactory interviews between the reformer and the poet in regard to the work in which the latter was engaged, but in this he has given the reins to his fancy not less markedly than he has again and again charged M. D'Aubigné with doing in his history. He produces not a tittle of evidence to show that Calvin was positively unkind to the poet or unmindful of the great services he had rendered in the cause of sacred song. It is true that he did not expressly mention his name in the early editions of his psalter, but neither did he mention his own; and when his friend Beza completed the translation and prefixed to it his poetical epistle *A l'église de nostre Seigneur*, he did full justice to the merits of the poet, and gave his name the place of honour on the title-page. But, as in the case of many other exiles before and afterwards, the reformer was unable to persuade the council to deal so liberally with Marôt as he desired. In consequence, the poet was disappointed and perhaps soured; besides, the laws and customs of the place were not altogether to his courtly taste, and as he knew that the reformer was not disposed to let these be trampled under foot by the dearest of his friends, it is supposed that before the end of the year he deemed it advisable to leave Geneva, and returned to Savoy. His last days were spent there, and according to his latest biographer, he remained faithful to his religious convictions, and would never have recourse to the same questionable means of securing the favour of his old patron the King of France, as some of the other exiles did. "He found on the banks of the Po only increased privation and suffering," and in his own painful experience had to realise the truth of the words of Scripture so beautifully paraphrased in one of his minor poems, that "we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God." He died, after a brief illness, in 1544, about the month of August, in the forty-seventh year of his age. The charges of gross misconduct brought against him while he resided at Geneva, especially by Roman Catholic historians, have been satisfactorily refuted both by Bayle and Douen.

After Marôt's death, Calvin, still intent on completing the work on which his heart had so long been set, and longing to make the book of psalms the great book of praise in the Reformed Church, anxiously looked out for some one to take the place of the poet he had lost. Calling one day on Beza, and not finding him, he saw on his desk a metrical translation of a verse or two of one of the psalms. He was so pleased with this that he took it with him and, without apprising the

author of his intention, read it to the consistory, and got its members to join him in entreating Beza to undertake the task for which he seemed so well fitted. Beza consented, and being shortly after transferred to Lausanne, set to the work without delay. In 1552 there appeared at Geneva "*Pseaumes Octante Trois de David mis en rithme François . . . quarante neuf par Clement Marôt . . . trente quatre par Theodore de Besze.*" Six more were added in 1555. In 1561 the task was completed, and in the Genevan edition of that year the prose translation of each verse was inserted on the margin alongside the corresponding verse in metre—a practice which was long followed in Scotland, as well as in France and Switzerland. Beza's translations are not generally deemed equal to those of the great French poet, but most of them are carefully and creditably executed, and several are acknowledged to be of great merit, and were long popular among the Huguenots of France. It is to him they owed their "*Marseillaise*," their battle psalm, the 68th, the grand tune of which was originally set to Calvin's version of psalm 36. He also is the author of the version of the 42nd, which M. Bovet pronounces to be one of the finest in the psalter.

The merits of Marôt's versions are great, and have been long acknowledged. No doubt, as the Papists liked to repeat, he stumbled on the threshold and occasionally sunk below what might have been expected of the best poet of the time. But, generally, his translations were faithful and spirited, and he was far more regardful of the *parallelismus membrorum* than the authors of our own noble version. He was happy in his metres, and had the good fortune to have them set to fitting tunes.

M. Bovet,* in his Bibliographical Appendix to his History of the Psalter, enumerates upwards of one hundred editions of it as printed in the sixteenth century, and at least as many more in the seventeenth. Such was the popularity of its metres and melodies that, before the end of the sixteenth century, psalters modelled on the French were published in Flemish, Dutch, German, Latin, and Italian (partially), and in the succeeding century in Spanish (partially), in Hungarian, Bohemian, Danish, and even in Hebrew (partially). The English metrical psalter was not so closely modelled on the French as these others were, though indebted to it for several of its best metres and tunes. The forty-four psalms published by Sternhold and Hopkins in 1549 formed the basis of it. They were almost all versified in stanzas of four lines, which lines consisted alternately of eight and six syllables, as if intended to be sung to the old chants. But the English exiles at Geneva, as much captivated by the singing they heard there as Calvin had been by that of Germany, enriched the psalter they published in 1556 by several new metres, generally resembling the French, and capable of being sung to the

* "*Histoire du Psautier—Bibliographie.*" A British Puritan cannot but regret that when M. Bovet has given so fully the bibliography of the French, and even of the German Psalter, he should have mentioned but two of the English editions—though Calvin's own brother-in-law, Whittingham, had so much to do with them.

French tunes. Some of these new metres, and others which they afterwards added, were among the most popular in the old Scottish Psalter, though it must not be forgotten that for a long time in Scotland, as well as in France, the psalms were sung in regular order. The Anglo-Genevan Psalter of 1556 contained fifty-one psalms, that of 1560 sixty-five, and that of 1561 eighty-seven. The psalter in its English form was completed in 1562, and published in London. In its Scottish form it was only completed about two years later, and in 1564-5 it was published in Edinburgh.

At first the French psalms appear to have been sung to the airs of popular songs. They were so sung by the courtiers of Francis I. and Henry II., as Florimond de Raymond and others testify. That probably was Marôt's original intention, as well as that of the chaplain of the Queen of Hungary, who published an edition of them in 1541 at Antwerp. But Calvin, "unmusical" as he is said to be, had not been long among the Germans when he determined to prefer their chorale music and the old church chants. The tunes in the edition of 1539 were mainly from these sources. There has been much disputing as to whether Franc or Goudimel or Bourgeois composed the tunes which, from 1542 downwards, began to adorn the Genevan editions. But both Bovet and Douen decide in favour of Bourgeois, whom they term the veritable "Palissy of music."* The variations he made on the original German tunes, and the additional ones which he partly composed, partly selected and improved, were of such acknowledged excellence that they became almost as popular among the Germans (through Lobwasser's Psalter) as they long continued among the French. The tunes of Franc, who, like Bourgeois, was *chantre* at Geneva from 1541, are said to have been those which appeared in the church of Lausanne, to which he removed in 1545. They are not recognised as being nearly of the same merit as those of Bourgeois. The work of Goudimel, M. Douen maintains, was merely to harmonise the tunes previously existing, and its results are mainly given in his *Les cent cinquante Psaumes de David, nouvellement*

* Fourteen of the old Strassburg tunes have been retained, three almost in their original form, the rest considerably modified. Sixty-nine tunes have been selected or composed by Bourgeois, twelve of which retain nearly their original form—the rest being more or less retouched and improved by him. "The reader familiar with our psalter will have remarked," says Douen, "that almost all the most beautiful, the most original, and most melodious airs belong to the period of Bourgeois. He will also have remarked the fertility, the taste, and the profoundly religious sentiment which the indefatigable artist has shown in so marvellously adapting all the tunes to the Hebrew hymns. If the melancholy and the plaintive accents of the minor key give the dominant character to his work, yet he has known how to express the strength and joy of the new world once more finding its God, whom the Church of the Middle Ages had concealed by gigantic tyranny and superstition. He has the joy of Luther, and makes it felt in such heroic melodies as those attached to psalms xxv., xxxvi., xlii., cxxxviii., written in the major key, as also in seventeen others." Bourgeois left Geneva in 1557, according to some because he was not allowed to introduce part-singing, according to others because his salary was so insufficient.

mis en musique a quatre parties, par C. Goudimel, Paris, 1565, 4 vols. This or Bourgeois' work, as well as the psalter of 1561, was probably in the hands of our countryman, Thomas Wood, when, in 1566, he set about preparing his Harmony in four parts, three of which are still preserved, and have been reported on by Rev. N. Livingstone in his valuable reprint of the Scottish Psalter of 1635, and by the late David Laing, Esq., in a very interesting paper read to the Society of Antiquaries in Scotland, and afterwards separately reprinted. At least I find a Thomas Wood among the members of Knox's congregation at Geneva, whom I am inclined to identify with the author of the musical psalter in question.

Such is a brief account of the work of Calvin, and the gifted men he called to his aid in preparing a worthy service of song for the Reformed Churches. He was not like Luther, a great poet himself, though one hymn has been attributed to him, which in our own day has been translated both into German and English, and of which one who is no mean judge has said that "it reveals a poetic vein, and a devotional fervour and tenderness which one could hardly have expected in so severe a logician."* But he recognised the gift in others which he claimed in moderate measure for himself, appreciated its value to the Church of God, and so successfully utilised the labours of Marôt, Beza, and Bourgeois, that the metres and tunes of this psalter passed into all the Reformed Churches in their several languages, and gained extensive currency even in Germany itself. Thus his psalmody was only a less influential element in sustaining the faith and nerving the spirits of the faithful than his strict discipline and carefully compacted system of doctrine. Englishmen should perhaps least of all wonder at such many-sidedness, and indulge in such diatribes as I adverted to at the outset, when they remember that they owe the best hymn in their own language to one who was more Calvinistic than Calvin, and as keenly disputatious as he. If we can now sing and enjoy the "Rock of Ages" of Toplady, and the "Jesus lover of my soul" of the Wesleys, forgetful of the fierce strife that reigned between their authors, it is surely not too much to hope that the time may come when we may enjoy the hymns and music, both of the ancient and of the Lutheran Churches, without reviling him who in a great measure has made us what we are, and has left us some treasures of true devotion, and not a little chaste and impressive music of which we have no cause to be ashamed. I cannot believe that he himself was insensible to the beauty of the old Latin, any more than to that of the modern German hymns, or would have disapproved of aught in them that was not erroneous or superstitious. I admit he was perhaps over-anxious to confine the service of praise to those songs of Zion which the inspired volume had provided, and especially to the psalms of the Hebrew poets, which are still the inspiring source of all that is grandest in church liturgies and hymn-books. It was no mean service he rendered to the Church of God in getting these put into a shape, and

* Schaff's "Christ in Song."

adapted to music which kindled the devotion, sustained the faith, and cheered the hearts of so many in his own and succeeding times. Whatever may be the case now, there can be no question that in the sixteenth century it was among those who followed him most closely, in England as well as in Scotland, that congregational singing was most zealously fostered and maintained. Such singing was long and successfully cultivated in Scotland, and, strange as it may seem to some modern Congregationalists, it was not till the Presbyterians of Scotland were brought into close contact with the Independents of England, and to please them, introduced the absurd and, in Scotland, unnecessary practice of "reading the line," that an arrest was put on Church music, which neither the persecutions of the seventeenth nor the deadness of the eighteenth century tended to remove. It is much to be wished that the revival which has now begun should take a direction in accordance with our historical position, and should not refuse to avail itself of that chaste but impressive music which even Mozart commended, and which Hullah, Mainzer, and others have shown only requires to be properly sung to produce all its former blessed effects. Those who witnessed the tasteful and impressive singing at last meeting of the General Presbyterian Council, I feel sure, will heartily concur in this, and would thank God if they were spared to see the day when it was universal. While saying this frankly and cordially, I hope I shall be pardoned for adding that I cannot persuade myself that if Calvin and his gifted coadjutors had lived in our day, they would have blamed the Reformed Churches for endeavouring to add to the treasures of poetry and music they had bequeathed, the stores of other noble men whom God has raised up, either in earlier or later times.

ALEX. F. MITCHELL.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF IRELAND.

THE Episcopal Church of Ireland has had a strange career. As organised in the time of Henry VIII., it retained almost all the elements of Popery, with the exception of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. When Edward VI. ascended the throne, there was not a single individual among its bishops and clergy to whom we can point as a very earnest and intelligent Protestant. Even at the death of Elizabeth, the Reformed faith had made little progress in the country. During the next thirty-five years it advanced more hopefully; the great names of Ussher and Bedell then adorn its annals; and the Plantation of Ulster gave it a firm hold on the Northern Province. Soon afterwards the Episcopal Church was overthrown; and preachers of various denominations, scattered over the island, were paid by the Republican Government. On the restoration of Charles II. to the throne, Irish Episcopacy resumed its dominion; but it had not profited by adversity;

for so great was its intolerance and heartlessness, that it made no favourable impression on the mass of the population. During the whole of the eighteenth century it had a monotonous and melancholy history. Backed by the penal laws, it attempted to win over both Romanists and Presbyterians; and, though it thus gained a considerable number of dubious proselytes, it completely failed to commend itself to respect and confidence. It had, no doubt, meanwhile some able preachers and exemplary pastors; but, as a Church, it exhibited little spiritual vitality. Non-residence was quite common among the beneficed clergy; and whilst bishops, deans, and rectors fluttered about the Court in London and Dublin, or spent their time in other places of fashionable resort, they left weakling curates with miserable salaries to take care of the house of God. But about the commencement of the present century, a new order of things began to prevail. Ministers of apostolic zeal and piety, endowed with popular gifts, and possessed of a clear knowledge of the Gospel, were raised up in various parts of Ireland; and their labours produced important results. Such men as the Rev. B. W. Mathias, of Dublin; and the Rev. Peter Roe, of Kilkenny, proved signal blessings to the Irish Establishment. Not a few of the nobility and gentry, previously quite indifferent to religion, were led to think seriously of the great salvation, and to endeavour to promote the spiritual well-being of the lower classes around them. The spread of scriptural schools, and the activity of the Evangelical clergy, awakened the jealousy of the priests—for the new life infused into Protestant Episcopacy threatened the subversion of their authority. Just about this time the Romanists—recently restored to the enjoyment of the elective franchise—were beginning to realise their political strength. Their subsequent admission to Parliament added to their boldness; and, though they were pledged by oath not to use their increased power to the detriment of the Church as by law established, they soon forgot this obligation, and set on foot an agitation against tithes. The peasantry were stirred up to refuse payment; and, in not a few parishes in the Popish parts of Ireland, the Protestant incumbents were reduced almost to starvation, in consequence of the withdrawal of their means of subsistence. The commutation of tithes into a rent-charge, payable by the landlords, did not permanently improve their position. The cry for disestablishment, raised under the auspices of Cardinal Cullen, was now vehemently urged; and, after a brief but bitter struggle, the Church Act—which put an end to the reign of Episcopacy in Ireland—became in 1869 the law of the land.

The Church Act came into operation on the 1st of January, 1871. The eight years which have since passed away form an interesting section in the history of Irish Protestantism; and, as many of our readers may not be acquainted with late changes, we propose to devote the sequel of this article to the consideration of the present state and prospects of the Episcopal Church as disestablished.

I. Though the material resources of Irish Episcopacy have been considerably curtailed by recent legislation, the representative "Church Body"—entrusted with the funds conveyed to it, by way of compensation, under the Irish Church Act—is withal a wealthy corporation. This Church Body, consisting of all the prelates with lay and clerical representatives conjoined, has under its charge a capital of about seven millions sterling. In 1871, according to the Government census, Irish Episcopalians amounted to 683,000 ; but the Primitive Methodists—estimated, members and adherents included, at 30,000—have since withdrawn from them ; and now they probably do not much exceed 650,000. The Irish Presbyterians amount to half-a-million, so that, with one-third added to their numbers, they would fully equal the Episcopalians. But the commutation money in the hands of their trustees, and received by them as compensation for the Regium Donum under the Church Act, is not *one-twelfth* of the corresponding capital possessed by the Episcopalian Church Body. In addition to a very ample equivalent for vested interests, the Episcopalians obtained, at the time of disestablishment, as a free gift from the State, all the cathedrals and churches which they then occupied. At the same period the Episcopal palaces, rectories, and parsonages, with certain glebe lands attached, were given to them at little more than a nominal value. Reckoning all these sources of provision, it may safely be asserted that, apart altogether from the voluntary contributions of its members, the Irish Episcopal Church has, at the present moment, an endowment of nearly ten shillings a-year in perpetuity, for the religious instruction of every man, woman, and child in its communion. The glaring abuses connected with the unequal distribution of its ecclesiastical wealth, which formerly created so much scandal, have now been, to a great extent, redressed. Irish bishops, with £8000 or £10,000 a-year, no longer roll about in splendour in London or Bath, whilst multitudes of curates at home pine on an annual pittance of £40 or £50. Since disestablishment, the curates generally have salaries ranging from £100 to £150 a-year. The income of a rector is now rarely more than double or treble the allowance of a curate ; and bishops recently appointed must be content with revenues not exceeding £1500 or £2000 per annum. The endowments of the Church, supplemented by the voluntary contributions of the people, place not a few of the incumbents in circumstances in which they have no reason whatever to complain of poverty. Episcopalians, though less than one-eighth of the Irish people, possess a very large share of the wealth of the country. Almost all the nobility, and by far the greater portion of the gentry and landed proprietors, belong to their ranks ; and, had their Church not a single shilling in its treasury, its members would be well able to maintain all its ministers in comfort.

II. The increased activity exhibited by the Episcopal Church of Ireland since the period of disestablishment rebukes the folly of those

who predicted its speedy extinction. It is true that of late there has been a very marked diminution in the ranks of the clergy. According to the report of the Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland, the number of curates recognised as annuitants under the Church Act was 921, and we learn from a statement which appeared a few months ago in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* that they may now be estimated at 370. This startling decrease admits, however, of explanation. Immediately before disestablishment, the bishops manufactured hundreds of curates, many of whom had received little, if any, theological training, in the hope of thus gaining possession of a larger share of the Church revenues. Not a few of these new clerical recruits contrived to disappear as soon as they had secured their own share of the ecclesiastical spoils. They were, in reality, supernumeraries, and they could well be spared. A considerable number of incumbents also, seeing no prospect of further advancement in Ireland, repaired elsewhere on obtaining compensation for their vested interests. But by far the majority of the clergy—including the most distinguished of their order—displayed more piety as well as patriotism; and many of the laity, instead of being discouraged by the action of the Legislature, girded themselves for the maintenance of their Church with a zeal worthy of all praise. The manner in which the Romish priests often spoke of the Episcopal incumbents before the passing of the Church Act was as insolent as it was mendacious. Closing their eyes to the zeal, integrity, and quiet benevolence of not a few of them, these reverend agitators denounced the possessors of the glebes and tithes as a generation of time-servers, who had no faith in the religion which they preached. Cardinal Cullen himself did not scruple to declare openly that the Episcopal Church was kept alive by the public funds, and that it would perish were it not sustained by a State provision. The *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, published under his immediate supervision, proclaimed that "Protestantism has no other hold on its followers than the mere temporal endowments. The great motive is money. Remove this inducement, and they will become the followers of Rome." The history of the past eight years should be sufficient to convince all men of ordinary candour that, if those who uttered such statements were sincere, they laboured under a strange delusion. The Irish Episcopal Church contains multitudes of individuals of high Christian excellence, who have given the most convincing evidences of their strong attachment to its worship and constitution. Since disestablishment, its members have manifested an interest in its wellbeing such as they never exhibited before. Some of them have given princely donations for the building or embellishment of churches and cathedrals. Since 1870, the magnificent tribute of £1,808,442 has been paid into a Sustentation Fund;* and nobility and

* According to the *Journal* of the session of 1878, published by the authority of the General Synod (p. 105), the following are the contributions to this fund for the eight

gentry, associated with the clergy, have been seen, for weeks together, in attendance on a General Synod discussing questions relating to the improvement of their ecclesiastical administration.

III. Since the Irish Episcopal Church obtained the power of self-government, several important reforms have been made in its worship and discipline. The use of lessons from the Apocrypha in the public service—so long and so justly offensive to the best friends of Protestantism—has been discontinued. The reading of the Athanasian Creed—with all its atrocious dogmatism—thirteen or fourteen times every year, is no longer imperative. In the service for the visitation of the sick, the old Popish form of absolution—according to which the minister was required to say to the dying man, "*I absolve thee from all thy sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*"—is superseded by a prayer for pardon. Parents are now permitted to act as sponsors at the baptism of their children; and infants dying unbaptised are no longer placed in the same category with persons who have committed suicide. The Church is now governed by Diocesan and General Synods; and in these courts, where clergy and laity are intermingled, the power of the bishops is, in various ways, abridged. The people are not now completely excluded from a share in the election of their ministers; for, though the arrangements in reference to the exercise of patronage are still very objectionable, the members of congregations can indirectly exert some influence in the choice of those who are to be over them in the Lord. When a vacancy occurs in any "cure of souls," the committee of patronage of the diocese, consisting of one lay and two clerical members, with the parochial nominators of the vacant cure, consisting of three persons chosen by the registered vestrymen of the parish, form, with the bishop as president, a board of nomination. The bishop has an independent vote, as well as a casting vote. This board appoints to the vacancy.

IV. Whilst these and other important changes in the constitution of the Irish Episcopal Church have taken place since disestablishment, it must be admitted that they have been made rather reluctantly. Nothing but the dread of an extensive schism constrained the high-church party to acquiesce in their adoption. Every step in the direction

years which have intervened between the passing of the Church Act and the present time :—

Contributions for 1870	.	.	.	£229,753	14	2
Do. 1871	.	.	.	214,709	8	4
Do. 1872	.	.	.	248,445	1	8
Do. 1873	.	.	.	230,179	11	0
Do. 1874	.	.	.	257,021	2	1
Do. 1875	.	.	.	218,499	3	8
Do. 1876	.	.	.	212,095	7	7
Do. 1877	.	.	.	197,739	6	7
				£1,808,442	15	1

of reform has been keenly disputed. The opponents of revision have now completely secured the ascendancy; and they openly announce that they will permit no farther interference with the Prayer Book. Whilst the governing body, or, as it is called, the General Synod, is entitled to no small share of credit for what it has already done, it cannot be concealed that the improvements effected are very far from satisfactory. The Apocrypha has indeed been excluded from the public service; but the Church still "receives and approves" all the Thirty-nine Articles, and according to one of them (the sixth) this same Apocrypha—though it sanctions prayers for the dead, and the commission of suicide—is to be read "for *example* of life and *instruction* of manners." The use of the Athanasian Creed is no longer obligatory; but, notwithstanding, it holds its old position in the Prayer Book; its astounding declaration that whosoever does not keep the faith which it inculcates—with all its subtle, if not incomprehensible, distinctions—"whole and undefiled, shall, without doubt, perish everlastingly," is not expunged; it is stated in one of the articles (the eighth) that this creed is to be "*thoroughly received and believed*;" and any minister who pleases may still employ it in the congregational worship. The communicants are still required to partake of the Eucharist kneeling; and part of the formula pronounced by the minister, when he dispenses the elements, is a literal translation of the words in the Romish Mass Book. The baptismal service, which asserts the doctrine of baptismal regeneration as plainly as words can teach it, is unchanged; but, to propitiate those who have long scrupled to use it, there is a statement in the preface of the revised volume to the effect that those who employ it need not attach to it a literal meaning. This passage, which has been well described as "the equivocation clause," betrays the perplexity of purblind and bewildered theologians. On the whole, this new Prayer Book has quite too much of a Popish complexion, and is very unworthy of a true Protestant Church. Nor is the new constitution of Irish Episcopacy such as ought to give contentment to those who properly understand their rights and privileges as the Lord's freemen. It is artfully contrived to give to the laity a show of power with very little of the reality. In the election of ministers, the bishop and the diocesan nominators can, in every case, override the parochial nominators. A strong-willed prelate of ability and tact can generally manage to put his own favourites into vacancies. The system of government adopted by the disestablished Church is an incongruous medley of Episcopacy, Presbytery, and Congregationalism. It can point back to nothing like itself in all ecclesiastical antiquity. Any lay individual who has attained the age of twenty-one years, who professes to belong to the Church, and who describes himself as a communicant—no matter how great may be his ignorance or how dubious his reputation—may act as a parochial nominator, and may be a member of the highest court of ecclesiastical legislation. The laity and the clergy sit in synods in the

proportion of two to one ; but, as the voting is by orders, this preponderance of numbers does not give to the popular element the slightest additional influence. In the General Synod a majority of two-thirds of *each order* is required to carry any resolution tending to modify existing canons—so that, when a minority of the clergy oppose any measure, they may defeat the majority of their brethren even when sustained by the suffrages of every one of the lay representatives. Under such conditions, a clique of high-church parsons, unsupported by a single layman, may effectually bar the way to reformation.

V. We have no wish to speak disparagingly of the Episcopal Church ; for we know that among its members are not a few of the excellent of the earth, and, gladly would we record the prosperity of every branch of the great Protestant family. Deeply do we sympathise with those who have been struggling for further reformation. We cannot, however, but regret that progress in the good path has been so slow and so unpromising. This Church has had a noble opportunity of remodelling its framework, and of removing from its ritual blemishes which have long prevented sincere and enlightened Christians from joining its communion ; but it has not yet had the wisdom and the grace to enter on the work in right earnest. The laity in the General Synod have signalised themselves by a far healthier Protestantism than the clergy ; and the bishops in office before the passing of the Church Act have shown, by their persistent opposition, that they are the most determined enemies of all ecclesiastical renovation. Many have found it difficult to account for the conduct of these Most Reverend and Right Reverend personages. Some of them, it is said, are still looking for preferment across the channel ; and fear that, by consenting to extensive changes in the Irish Prayer Book, they may at once alienate the English Church, and injure their own prospects of promotion. The Diocesan Synods now nominate the bishops, and this new method of selection is evidently incomparably superior to the old system of Government patronage. Five Episcopal appointments have been made since disestablishment ; and it would appear that the choice has invariably fallen on a very eligible candidate. Lord Plunket, the new Bishop of Meath, seems specially fitted for the position he has been called to occupy. On one or two public occasions he has done credit to himself by the way in which he has spoken of Irish Presbyterians ; it may be that he retains some kindly recollections of his own Presbyterian ancestry ; and were all his Episcopal brethren to cultivate the same conciliatory spirit, they would greatly contribute to promote charity and peace. But it has been remarked that since disestablishment the Episcopal clergy, as a body, have not much improved in the spirit of catholicity. They are now placed by law on a perfect level with the Protestant ministers around them, and yet they are evidently most unwilling to realise their new position. They continue to speak even of their Presbyterian neighbours as “sectaries,” and “dissenters.” The pertinacity with

which they adhere to the title of "*the Church of Ireland*"—as if no other Church save their own existed in the country—is as silly as it is uncharitable. Puffed up with self-importance by the doctrine of apostolical succession, and apparently never suspecting that the doctrine is based on a myth—for ordination by the presbyter abbot and his brotherhood was the rule in the old Church of Ireland—they imagine that they alone are competent rightly to administer the ordinances of religion. Their increased activity of late years has certainly not been accompanied by increased enlightenment. It has revealed itself in an increased desire for mere proselytism, and in increased attention to ritual observances, to the keeping of saints' days, and to the floral decoration of churches. As to a system of theology, the Irish Episcopal ministers may be said to have none. The Thirty-nine Articles were drawn up by Calvinistic divines; and the Irish Confession, prepared by Ussher in 1615, inculcates the very same doctrines taught by the Westminster Assembly; but Calvinism is now the abomination of a large proportion of the disestablished clergy. They cannot even speak of it without using some opprobrious epithet. Thus they separate themselves by a great gulf from the ministers of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.

When the Bill for disestablishment was brought under the consideration of the British Legislature, the members of the Irish Episcopal Church were filled with alarm. Even the Protestant Primate of Armagh could not conceal his consternation. In a letter, which at the time went the round of the newspapers, he announced his conviction that the passing of the Bill would result in the most disastrous consequences—social and religious. None of these dire forebodings have been fulfilled. For ages Ireland never has been in such hopeful circumstances as it is at present. Well may the Irish Episcopal Church say that it has been good for her that she has been afflicted. She is now in a better position than she ever was before. She has still abundant wealth at her command; her machinery has been improved; and some at least of the leaven of Popery has been purged out of her formularies. It is noteworthy that the changes introduced into the Prayer Book have been all made in the direction of Presbyterianism. For two hundred and fifty-years Presbyterians protested against the use of the Apocrypha in public worship, against the reading of the Athanasian Creed, against the Popish form of absolution in the service for the visitation of the sick, against the exclusion of parents as sponsors at the baptism of their own children, and against other objectionable arrangements now set aside; but generation after generation passed away, and all their remonstrances were disregarded. It is now openly admitted that for ages they had truth and right on their side—so that Episcopalians should express themselves more modestly when they venture hereafter to charge others with the sin of schism. Every Church which insists on terms of communion not sanctioned by the law of Christ is liable to

this grave indictment. Nor should it be forgotten that the Irish Episcopal Church, in returning to government by Diocesan and General Synods, has made another very considerable approximation to Presbyterianism. Could she but manage to free herself from the incubus of high-church clericalism which yet oppresses her, there is no reason why she should not go on taking lessons of instruction from the same teacher to whom she has already been so much indebted; and, if so, who can tell how soon we may see in Ireland a consolidated and triumphant Protestantism!

W. D. KILLEN.

THE PERIL OF A DEGRADED PULPIT.

PREACHING, as the Gospel appoints it, is meant to save men. The accomplishment of this end is made to depend upon three things—two of them Divine, and one of them human. These are—the Divine truth preached, affectionate fidelity in preaching it, and the blessing of the Holy Ghost.

These three elements, accordingly, have made up the essence of successful preaching from the beginning until now. An additional human element, indeed, has sometimes been present, but far oftener absent—namely, a natural or acquired power of captivating address. That such power can greatly serve a devoted preacher, no one will deny. But captivating, oratorical power is a rare endowment; and the combination of such power with the highest fidelity to Christ and the Gospel, is rarer still. When it occurs, as it did in Whitefield, it is a matter to be remembered and spoken of for generations. That rare powers of fascination may go into the pulpit, uncombined with fidelity, and command professional success, the church knows too well. But to balance the mischief which can be wrought by such exceptional intrusions, she also knows that fidelity, apart from genius, is common, and that it carries the promise of Divine success. Our day, no less than others, has given notable proof that affectionate sincerity in the utterance of the Gospel has, by God's help, a fascination of its own that reaches as much deeper than the arts or gifts of human oratory, as men's sense of conscience, of God, and of eternity lies deeper than their tastes,—a fascination which even in its power to attract a crowd can dispense with every unusual charm of speech; but which, above all, has this peculiar quality, that five men drawn by it to the hearing of the Gospel preached with demonstration of the Spirit, give promise of larger spiritual results than a hundred men drawn by human fascinations of any sort.

If this be true, the highest interest which loyal Churches can have in

their preachers is to keep them single-hearted and faithful in preaching the Gospel.

But the fidelity of a preacher, like that of any other man, may be affected favourably or unfavourably by the conditions under which his duty is to be discharged.

There have been occasions in the history of the Church, in which the foremost and weightiest matter in the consciousness of any true preacher has been the fact that Christ and the Holy Ghost were making use of him. It was so at the beginning. What external stimulus had Paul at Mars' Hill? Every face he saw was the face of an unbeliever and an opposer. Only in his heart was there a sense of friendly might. He was God's ambassador, ordained and upheld by Christ and His Spirit; and he needed human consent and support no more than the lightning does. His resources were in heaven.

The same was true of Luther in his great emergencies; and the same, in large measure, of Whitefield, Nettleton, and of every earnest evangelist, in whose view the congregation is chiefly a multitude of perishing men, and he himself a preacher of salvation. Let the multitude be friendly or opposed, he has a message from God, and they shall hear it.

But there is risk of a great change in the preacher's conscious relations both to his hearers and his message, when, instead of preaching like an apostle or an evangelist, to an aggregate of unknown men, he regularly meets the definite congregation which engages him to be its own preacher, and pledges him support.

There is one condition indeed, and only one, under which such a change of relations may threaten no harm to the preacher's faithful purpose. It may even intensify it. Let the men who employ their preacher be known to entertain the true conception of his calling, and to be affording him their earthly support with the very intent with which Christ and the Holy Ghost sustain him from heaven. His preaching then becomes in effect their preaching; for all their hearts are flowing out at his lips. Moreover, while he is preaching, they are praying for his success; for which, when the preaching is ended, they still go on to labour; so that the faith and labour of all the church reinforce the faith and labour of their minister. In such relations, the human artillery of preaching is working at its very best. The preacher is set as a great gun pointed straight at the enemy's fort. The people, with their ammunition, keep the gun thundering, and the balls flying; and they crowd to the breaches, sword in hand.

But such a backing of a preacher is costly to the backers; and in two ways.

It costs no little spiritual fidelity and effort. There must be in the people as true a zeal for Christ and for men's salvation as there is in the preacher. There must be punctuality in all the duties of worship and Christian work, and a scrupulous fidelity in holy living.

The other cost is in money. It is commonly found, indeed, that

where the spiritual cost is fully and cheerfully met, the cost in money proves light, even to those whose means are small. But when the church has anything less than a predominant interest of its own in the work and glory of Christ, the problem of money mounts up into importance and difficulty.

The solution of this problem is sometimes met, as in Scotland, by general funds, which tend to obviate the dangers of which we are now to speak. But in many cases the financial management is naturally thrown upon the men in the congregation who have most experience in pecuniary affairs. These having it for an axiom that men and institutions succeed in business in proportion as they command income from the general community, may see no reason why the financial success of the church should not be secured upon the same principle. And the principle would fully apply if the world were as eager an applicant for a pure gospel as it is for goods, and insurance, and stocks that pay dividends.

But it is well known that many men who have no sympathy with the distinctive ends or elements of gospel preaching, may be greatly interested in many pleasing features of popular address, even though they be presented in a pulpit. If these men, then, are to be made the church's customers, it must be through the effectual, though tacit, recognition of a second principle of business, which is just as axiomatic and imperative as the other; namely, that the market must follow the tastes of the consumer. So soon, then, as a church shall admit, even to herself, that her maintenance of preaching depends upon the accession of income which the preaching can command from the world, of course she puts herself under the necessity of estimating preaching with the world's eyes.

The admission of such dependence among us is not uncommon. It is one of the saddest features of the working of Protestant Christianity, especially in America, that by denominational divisions of strength and by local rivalries which are scarcely more dignified than those of common business, multitudes of churches are drilled into such a sense of need of the pecuniary favour of the community that the arts of conciliating income are regarded as of the very essence of religion. Are they not practised for "the Church"? And is not "the Church" religion? How can they be wrong? This ruinous error once accepted, it becomes inevitable that a chief responsibility for attracting money should be thrown on the preacher, upon whose performances the interest of the public service so greatly depends, and whose share in the income is so large. And thus, by influences so imperative that they are counted to be reasonable and right, the ambassador of Christ is made to stand forth as the public wrestler with difficulties of finance. That is, he is not only required to exert that immense power of drawing men to listen for their soul's salvation, which Christ and the Holy Spirit have put into all manly and earnest preaching. He must exert, besides, some personal and professional power of enlisting contributors to a needed fund. He

must preach, with one eye to saving men, on which side grace promises help; and with another eye to income, on which side he must put forth his own strength. The "world" thus becomes his "field" in a double sense. He is not only to sow it with the seed of the Gospel; he must reap it of a worldly harvest, and therefore must see to it that the sword of the Spirit, as he wields it, has the right crook in it, so that it will cut grain!

In cities and large villages where the competition of denominations and congregations is most eager, and where the accomplishments of preachers are so easily compared, this pecuniary issue often grows so large that no preacher can lose sight of it. The demeanour with which his best friends listen to him, the comments on his preaching, which they unconsciously imply or carefully utter, all assume the important business interest in which he and his performances are felt to be the chief "stock in trade." Thus pressed into the market, the preacher will be exposed to three great temptations.

1. He will be tempted to defer to worldliness and sin, and so to abate the preaching of the law of God. The worldly part of the most Christian community is sure to maintain unchristian practices. One most effectual correction of these is appointed to lie in the holy living of the Christian Church. But a large part of the Church itself may possibly be degraded by the example of the world. In that case, the faithful preaching of gospel duty becomes the necessary leverage for lifting up both the world and the Church; that is, it devolves upon one man to be faithful against the known dispositions of a large proportion, possibly a majority, of the supporters of himself and his work. For who but a spiritual Christian, that is already in an attitude of repentance, is willing to be reminded of his sins?

So placed, the preacher will find that many motives suggest to him not only prudent methods of speech, which are right, but timidity and silence, which are wrong. It is not pleasant to find fault, nor to excite a moral debate in consciences which are assumed to be too helpless to form and to keep to a right decision; nor to be represented as making a quixotic assault on the established usages of society; nor to offend hearers whose support is thought by all the church officers to be greatly needed. Is it not better, upon the whole, to preach a morality which all will approve, and to be sustained in such preaching, than to preach a morality that is sure to give offence, and so to bring the preaching to an end?

The result is, that men known to practise such irregularities in personal, social, political, and business life, as would have been met with searching condemnation in the discourse or epistle of an apostle, can sit in many a church without hearing, from year's end to year's end, a word that brings their definite offence to mind.

2. The same influences will tempt the preacher to defer to unbelief, and so to abate the preaching of the truth of God. There have always

been unbelievers in Christian congregations. But in our day such men, taking encouragement from the united front and concerted outcry of so many enemies of faith, are dropping their disguises, declaring that the philosophic intellect of the world has pronounced against all supernatural religion. They do not for that reason entirely give up their church-going habits. The forms of worship they believe to be wholesome, and they are glad to countenance and sustain them. But they are sure that the time has gone by in which men could be expected to believe in a personal God, who can be angry against sin, and can threaten even persistent sinners with a hell in any sense real; and who could have sent His Son, who is also God, to become, in men's nature, a sacrifice for men's redemption. Let the minister believe these things if he must, but why produce them to the indifference and contempt of both friends and strangers?

The concession which is made to such objectors may take either of two forms. The distasteful doctrines may still be preached, but timidly and by piecemeal, and with feeble deprecation of the foreseen objections; or the distinctive truths of the Gospel may be sunk out of view, only so much of Christianity being retained as by centuries of more faithful preaching has percolated to infidelity itself—a "Broad Church" Christianity, which a skilful preacher can announce with just so much admixture of Christian phraseology and allusion as shall not disgust an unbeliever, while it may pass, with such believers as are not too attentive, for a kind of Gospel.

Just such preaching as this is rife in Christendom to-day; and it is not confined to pulpits which avow their departure from the ancient faith. In many instances, no doubt, it fairly represents the unbelief of the pretender himself. In many others it is a tribute, deliberate or instinctive, to the demand of the paying pews; and in other instances, where there is no such mercenary motive, it is the result of a poor ambition to stand well with cultivated or distinguished men.

3. A third temptation is more subtle, and therefore, to honest preachers, more dangerous than either of the others. It is the temptation to defer to taste and sentiment, and so to degrade the preaching even of sound gospel doctrine and morality into a means of entertainment.

It is not wrong to charm men with preaching; for faithful preaching, as we have seen already, has always a certain power to charm men. Truth and true feeling are the parents of eloquence. Let them meet on the plainest lips, and eloquence is born; especially when the truth and the feeling concern Christ and salvation. And whenever to this eloquence of gospel sincerity there is added the eloquence of genius, the true and gifted preacher becomes the greatest charmer that is known among men. Gospel truth lights upon him like the sun on the earth in the morning. There are no heights nor depths in him which it does not kindle. Everything wakes and stirs, for God awakens him. Thought, fancy, affection, language, tone, look, movement—all are alive, and play

after their kind. He may lack elements of natural or artificial grace. He shall not lack the highest grace—the grace of manhood, lifted to its sterling grandeur by the inspiration of the Almighty. No; he shall charm when he speaks of the bright and gracious things of the Gospel. And when he speaks of the most awful facts of sin, and wrath, and eternity, since he himself melts and trembles under his awful message, he shall charm even then.

But the consecrated genius which achieves this very triumph never makes such a triumph its aim. It aims to preach, as a ship aims to sail. If, while she sails, there is music in the cordage, the wind makes that. Yet, from the lawfulness and excellence of such natural exercise of special gifts, it is concluded, by a mischievous sophism, that a preacher has a right to go into a pulpit chiefly to please men; and that God's saving truth is the material of his art. An artistic rhetoric is to shape it, artistic illustration is to set it off, artistic oratory is to pronounce it, that the charming product may bring its price. So into the Church of God there comes what dare not intrude even into a home or a store—a sentimental echo of reality that claims to be real. The echo of common life betakes itself to a theatre, and puts its artificial words and tones, its grimacing and posturing, upon a stage. The sentimental echo of religion invades the sanctuary, where music brings in the voices of strangers to charm with tones which no feeling of piety ever could have prompted, and the preacher parodies with æsthetic oratory the emotion which he does not feel. The parody can be made with fine taste or with gross—with the arts of a scholar or the arts of a buffoon. In either case, the audience recognises the sentimental tribute that has been paid upon its demand, and is delighted with a pulpit that makes religion so easy. For if taste and sentiment in the preacher are competent to make the appeal, taste and sentiment in the hearer are endorsed as competent to make the response. Their artificial thrill they feel together. Upon one smooth tide that is made to sweep within the picturesque shadows of the awful mountains, but never touches either Sinai or Calvary, preacher and hearers glide down together in their Sunday boat, and mistake their sentimental treat for faith and repentance and the life of God.

These three temptations manifestly resolve themselves into one—the temptation to divest Christianity of its awfulness, in order to make it a commodity agreeable to taste, respectability, and natural religiousness. It is a temptation to gain power for the pulpit by the destruction of its power—to gain a power of thrift by destroying its power for salvation.

The ruinous effects of so common a mistake are manifest and widespread among us, and they are fast increasing. A pulpit known to have become a solicitor of worldly favour and support loses respect, and so prevents all proper recognition even of so much truth as it continues to proclaim. The contributor whom it is so careful to conciliate is not likely to tremble before it as before the voice of God. Worse even than

that, the moment the Church stoops to cater to worldly acceptance, she becomes an active disseminator of infidelity ; for she confesses that her own hope and energy come from below, by cultivating men, and not from above, out of the truth and power of God.

Upon the preachers themselves this system of adventurership and anxiety produces sad effects. So many of them as, coming within the temptation, resolve to be faithful at all hazards, are subjected to endless struggles and annoyances, both within and without. Those of them who wrong their consciences by accepting their worldly function, of course load themselves with great dissatisfaction and wretchedness. And if any succeed in persuading themselves that the exchange of gospel fidelity for popularity is right, even these commit themselves to a profession, the most precarious and anxious that men can follow. In place of their one Master, Christ, whom they desert, they accept as many masters as there are separate notions among their people as to the best arts for drawing the multitude. Since ecclesiastical competition is so large, and since there is so little disposition in most communities to give much money to churches, the financial expectations that are built upon preaching must in many instances fail. A genius or a curiosity makes the only sure exception. A common result in America is, that the embarrassed church exchanges one disappointing clerical venture for another ; and a succession of short and anxious engagements makes up the life of many a preacher, who if kept to gospel preaching for the saving of souls, and not to popular preaching for increasing income, might have been abundantly successful. No wonder if observing youths decide that a shifting servitude to the worldly emergencies of churches is such an addition to the appointed cross-bearing of Christ's ministers as they are not called upon to accept.

If would be sad if the representation here made exhibited the only side of American Church life. To say that would be a great slander. The number of preachers who preach with fidelity is large in all the denominations. And many of them are for their faithful work's sake lovingly and generously supported both with means and sympathetic help. But a multitude remain who would thank God with tears if they could once for all cease to be Sunday competitors before a world of customers, and be simple preachers to a world of sinners.

There is one obvious way to the deliverance at least of most of them. The first step would be to set all the expenses of Christian worship, whether of the preacher's salary, of erecting churches, or of whatever else, at the limits of a wise but just economy. That being done, there should be between the preacher and the church a Christian and conscientious division of burdens. In every church except the poorest it should be understood that God has absolute claim to two things—first, to the devoted and unperplexed spiritual service of His minister, who, if he be remiss or incompetent in that work, should be required to surrender it ; and second, to so much of the means belonging to the

church as is necessary to put the faithful preacher on a firm vantage-ground before the world. Those means should be given cheerfully, as unto the Lord, and according to each man's candid estimate of his whole ability. This ought not to preclude willing men, who are not in the church, from concurring in that honourable and cheerful work. But the whole community should be made to feel that it is the church herself that puts forth her preaching, with a sense of obligation to God and authority from Him ; and that while both church and preacher are intent upon winning men, it is by no worldly means, and for no worldly advantage, even of the church, but by means of the pure Gospel, and for men's salvation and Christ's glory.

If the churches could be brought to unite in such an attitude, the whole aspect of the battle between religion and irreligion would be changed. It is professional Christianity that invites the world's contempt ; and nowhere more than in a pulpit which the parsimony of the church compels to be time-serving in order to live. But a pure Gospel, backed up by adequate Christian strength, would be no professional thing, but a reality—a broadsword of steel—an edge of temper with bulk behind it, and with a momentum from God that should "turn to flight the armies of the aliens."

And such absolute union between the Church and her preaching would be as serviceable to her financial success as to her spiritual. Men are shy of all beggars ; and the Protestant Christianity of any Anglo-Saxon nation has small excuse for begging at any worldly door. Her Master has put enough of His store into her own hands. Let her use it where it belongs ; and on principles of grace, and even of nature, strength will make strength. The cause of Christ, in America at least, needs nothing more at this time than such unmixed and unsolicitous preaching of the Gospel as may give proof at once of devoted ministers and of a devoted Church.

H. D. GANSE.

THE GENESIS OF PRESBYTERIANISM.

THE instrumentality which it has pleased the wisdom of God to employ for the redemption of the world from the bondage of sin is the CHURCH. In her has been kindled the light that is to dispel the darkness of error. But in order that the Church may fulfil her sublime mission, it is requisite that she should possess such a constitution as shall adapt her, in the most perfect manner, to her great ends, and furnish her, in the prosecution of these ends, with all the advantages which spring from combination and co-operation. The Church ought to be able, when her light waxes dim, to rekindle it afresh, and repel the night, which will constantly seek to recover its dominion over the

territory which had aforetime been won from it. But not only so, she ought to gather her light into a focus, and send it forth in a mighty illumination over the earth. She must marshal her members into an army, and march as an embannered host for the conquest of the world.

It is needless to say that all the reformers felt the immense importance of having a right constitution and government for the Church. But not less was the sense they entertained of the difficulty of originating and developing such. A single glance sufficed to show them that the task was a herculean one. They found no "cut-and-dry" plan of Church government in the Bible ; and in the absence of a scheme made ready to their hands, they had to cast about if haply they might discover some seed from which a plan of Church organisation might be evolved ; some truth, strong enough and broad enough, whereon to build as a foundation-stone. It was here as in the world of nature. The Creator has not reared mansions which man, without any labour or thought on his part, may occupy, but, on the one hand, He has endowed him with constructive faculties, and ; on the other, He has amply furnished him with materials for building. Drawing stones from the quarry, and arranging them according to the rules of art, man fashions for himself such a dwelling as his necessities and convenience require. No ecclesiastical fabric stood ready reared for the reformers, but the materials for constructing such lay all about. In proceeding in this important and necessary work, the reformers took into consideration the nature of the Church as revealed in the Word of God, the object she was intended to accomplish, the principles applicable to her constitution and government in the Bible, and the precedents of her early history ; and, guided by these lights, they came, in about half-a-century from the time that Luther had sounded the first note of the Reformation, to the completed development, both in theory and practice, of the Presbyterian form of Church government.

Their progress was slow and tentative. When experience showed them that they had fallen into error, they retraced their steps, and went back again to the principles of the Word of God, studying them anew in the light reflected on them by the exigencies of the Church's condition. Nor was the plan which they ultimately evolved the sole conception of any one reformer. It was the product of the labours of all the reformers. Each built upon the work of his predecessor. Slowly, story upon story, rose the fabric, overtopping in this country the altitude it had attained in that, as the centre of the Reformation shifted from one nation to another. Luther may be said to have laid the foundation. Knox brought forth the topstone.

The beginning of the matter was in this wise. Luther had now spent many years in the herculean labour of razing the Romish fabric. After years of demolition, and great and unexpected progress in that work, he found himself at last at the point where he was compelled to ask himself, "What organisation shall I put in the room of that which I

have overturned?" Though the "time to throw down" was not yet fully past, the "time to build" was fully come. Around him was something resembling chaos. Innumerable individuals had been rescued from popish error, and the truth which had been communicated to them was a secret bond, linking them to one another, constituting them a spiritual society, and making them participators in great spiritual privileges. Here was the Church invisible created by the truth. But by what bonds or laws was he to gather these converts into a Church *visible*, so that, as a corporate body, they might hold forth the truth to the world for its salvation?

He went to the Bible: and where else could he go, for in no other quarter could he so much as learn that there was a Church? He there found the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers. The apostle Peter, writing of the whole body of the Christian people, styled them a "royal priesthood." This was decisive. Here was the corner-stone of the spiritual building. The words of the apostle effectually demolished priesthood as a caste, and installed all believers in that dignity. Priesthood had been a caste under the Mosaic economy; it had once more become a caste under the sway of the Roman Church, but Luther discarded the idea; he despoiled the few that he might enrich the many. Fortified by the authority of the apostle, he distributed among the whole body of the faithful the powers and functions which the priestly caste of Rome had monopolised. The "government" and "worship" of the Church belonged to the "royal priesthood;" in other words, it was the common inheritance of the faithful.

A commencement had been made. The foundation-stone of Presbyterianism had been laid. But what should the second and third steps be? How was he to carry out the undoubted doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers so as to recognise the powers and functions of all, give each his proper place in the administration of the Church's affairs, and, at the same time, make the whole body amenable to an efficient government? The problem he had to solve was how to reconcile liberty with order.

Luther had to steer between anarchy and despotism. So it seemed to him—anarchy should he permit all the members of the Church to participate in the actual exercise of those functions which the Divine maxim he had adopted as his guiding principle declared to be the common inheritance of all; and despotism should he restrict ecclesiastical functions to a select number, who alone were to be invested with office. If he should adopt the latter alternative, would he not restore the *caste* he had just demolished—re-establish the ecclesiastical autocracy he had just cast down? How was he to steer the bark of the Church betwixt this new Scylla and Charybdis?

It was here that the representative principle—a great law of society—came to his aid. It was true, no doubt, that of the multitude of believing men, each one had vested in him the high functions of a

"king" and a "priest," but it was not necessary, nay it was not possible, that each should exercise these functions in his own person. These functions might be delegated; and if so delegated to certain of their own number, the fittest, of course, and discharged by them for the edification of the rest, were they not as really theirs as if they still retained the exercise of them in their own hands? They were, in fact, discharging them through their representatives. This expedient—suggested by reason itself—would obviate confusion, and a confusion so great that the Church would have been dissolved; for if all were teachers, and all were rulers, the taught and the ruled would be nowhere. Despotism, too, would, in this way, be rendered impossible, seeing those entrusted with the government of the Church were vested in no autocratic or arbitrary power; the authority they wielded was not their own, but that of the Church of God, whose delegates they were, and they exercised it under accountability to their brethren, and also to the Head of the Church. By this arrangement the "gifts" of ruling and teaching were still the Church's own; they were exercised with her consent, and for her benefit; her order was maintained, and yet her liberty was not infringed upon; and thus she escaped both rocks on one or other of which the maxim of "universal priesthood" had threatened to precipitate her.

But Luther was able to proceed only a little way. He had a firm hold of his principles. He saw that the Church must have a government; that that government ought to be exercised by spiritual men, and that it was in its own nature and domain distinct from civil government; but how to give effect to these principles in the face of mighty existing obstructions he knew not. Society was too ignorant and too carnal readily to submit to a spiritual jurisdiction. He did not see his way as yet to the appointment of a body of men who might exercise discipline in the Church. Meanwhile he cast himself upon the "pulpit" and the "communion table" as the chief agencies by which he must work. He hoped, by the preaching of the Gospel, to enlighten the darkness of his times, purify the rude mass, and slowly to evolve a society which should stand out distinct from the world by its superior knowledge and purity.

In the autumn of 1526 Luther received a commission from the Elector John to institute something like a Church organisation. In pursuance of this order, he set out on a tour of visitation of the churches of Saxony. He associated with himself in this important and delicate work Melancthon, Spalatin, and Thuring, to whom were assigned the visitation of the provinces of Altenburg, Thuringia, and Franconia. The main result of their labours was to bring to light the enormous anomalies and evils which everywhere defaced Germany. Men had cast off the authority of Rome, but in too many cases they had failed to submit themselves to the precepts of the Gospel. The Church and the world were largely mingled. How was a line of demarcation to be

drawn between the two? Clearly, this could not so well be done by the power of the prince, or by the power of the presbyter, as by the preaching of the Gospel, and the pure administration of the sacraments. The Word, by its searching power, would draw to itself the "holy," and would repel the "unholy," and thus, by a spiritual process, the Church would rise into shape and form before the eyes of men, and by her superior beauty attest that she was of a higher origin than earthly society, and regulated by higher laws. He forebore, meanwhile, therefore to institute a formal ecclesiastical discipline.

Not that Luther deemed such discipline in the House of God either unnecessary or unlawful. On the contrary, scattered through his writings are averments that among other "gifts" bestowed on the Church is that of "government." But in the immaturity of the Church in Saxony he had not the right men for the administration of that government. He sorrowfully confesses in his *German Mass and Order of Divine Worship* that he was unable to furnish a *working plan* for the government of the Church. "I have not the people," said he, "whom it requires. For we Germans are a wild, rude, riotous race, among whom it is not easy to set anything on foot, unless necessity compel."

At this point Luther halted. He had not been able to give full effect to all his views as regarded the Church's right constitution. She was far from possessing that self-regulation and control which belongs to a society complete and perfect in itself; but he hoped that his successors, who should live in happier times, would be able to supply what was still lacking. Meanwhile he worked with all his might to dispel that ignorance which encountered him everywhere, and formed his greatest obstruction. He compiled "Manuals of Doctrine;" he published "Larger and Shorter Catechisms;" he issued instructions to the pastors, and he appointed over them "superintendents" to watch their conduct and direct them in the discharge of their duties. Above all, he kindled the torch of a preached Gospel at the centre of the Church; and thus he hoped that, growing in knowledge, and enriched in due time with men of faith and wisdom, she would be able to take the direction of her own affairs into her own hands, and would come to be less exclusively dependent on the princes, who had hitherto exercised a very potential voice in her management,—the *summus magistratus* being, in fact, the *summus episcopus*,—but of whom it may be said in justification of their interference in the ecclesiastical arrangements of the period that they were integral parts of the spiritual body, and not less distinguished for their piety and zeal as members of the Church than conspicuous for their rank and station as members of the State.

Luther was followed in the work of church organisation by Melancthon, who carried it a little way beyond the point Luther had reached. Melancthon's contribution is an important one. Laying hold on the great principle that it is not lawful for any one person singly to exercise

an act of government or rule in the Church, he declared that ecclesiastical discipline can be rightly administered only by a body of delegates, or church members. When we speak of this as the special contribution of Melancthon, it is not to be understood as wholly so—or to the exclusion of Luther; but as implying that the former was the more prominent in proclaiming this principle—a principle which condemns as unlawful, in the House of God, autocracy, or “one-man rule.” In a joint epistle to the ministers of Nuremberg in 1540, the four Saxon reformers, Pomeranus, Jonas, Luther, and Melancthon, exhort those they were addressing to resume the practice of excommunication, annexing it as a condition that in this business elders be associated with the pastor. This is an approximation to the plan afterwards set forth by Calvin. But the ground gained by Melancthon was lost two years afterwards. The churches of the Lutheran Communion were then placed under a consistory, chosen by and responsible to the civil power. This last arrangement marks the farthest advance of the matter in Germany, for under this arrangement the Lutheran churches have continued to this day.*

Next in order of those who advanced the organisation of the Church comes Brentius. John Brentius was the reformer first of the free imperial city of Hall, in Swabia, and afterwards of the Duchy of Wurtemberg. Looking closely at apostolic times, he thought he could see the governing body of the Church constituted in a certain way, and that way he endeavoured to carry out in the following manner. First in the plan of Brentius came the bishop or overseer, and associated with him were certain honourable and discreet men, elected by the Christian people, and styled presbyters or councillors. These formed a synod or assembly. To this body belonged the power of admonishing offenders, and, if need were, of excommunicating them—in short, of discharging all acts of discipline. This was a well-defined plan, and it possessed this special recommendation, that it lodged the government of the Church in the hands of her own officers.

And yet near as Brentius had come to the plan of Church polity, established subsequently at Geneva and also in Scotland, he missed it. In his programme there entered an element that was fatal to its purity and vigour. This plan of church discipline, administered exclusively by the Church's own officers, was the only one lawful or possible in primitive times, he held, because in those days the magistrate was pagan, and could not take part in, much less control, the government of the Church. But now when the magistrate was Christian the case was altered; there was no necessity to shut him out from the administration of the Church's government; nay, there was a propriety in his sharing with the synod the labour of correcting and punishing church scandals. Had Brentius

* Dr. Lechler's article in *The Catholic Presbyterian* for February shows that earnest efforts have been made in Germany of late years to give effect to the Presbyterian element in the government of the Church.

been courageous enough to believe that the government fitted for the Church in the first century was equally fitted for her in the sixteenth ; that it was not less complete, and would be equally efficient under a Christian and under a pagan throne, he would have conferred a mighty blessing on the Reformation Church, by giving her at an early stage what she so much needed, a pure and vigorous administration. But by modifying his plan, he hopelessly vitiated and enfeebled it. He inextricably mixed up Church and State in the matter of discipline, and crowned the confusion by giving to the magistrate the power of nominating the lay assessors who were to sit and rule along with the pastor.

The same year which saw the disciplinary programme of John Brentius submitted to the Council of Hall, saw the plan of Francis Lambert put before the Committee of Homburg. Francis Lambert was altogether a remarkable man. In most picturesque guise did he present himself on the scene of his future labours. Bestriding an ass, his legs almost touching the ground, his naked feet thrust into sandals, his crown shaven, and the grey cloak of the Franciscan thrown over his person, the ex-monk of Avignon traversed Switzerland and Southern Germany, and halted only when he had arrived at the door of Luther, in Wittenberg. The reformer gave Lambert a letter of recommendation to Philip of Hesse, and the Landgrave, struck with the clear and broad views of the Franciscan, invited him to frame a constitution for the Reformed Church of Hesse. In this work Lambert had no model which he might follow, for the churches of Saxony had not yet been constituted, and accordingly, like Luther, he had to begin at the foundations. He published one hundred and forty-eight paradoxes, in which, plucking the impious mitre from the brow of the one priest of the Seven Hills, he placed it on the head of all believers. He chose the same corner-stone for his building which Luther had selected, the "universal priesthood," to wit. But the plan which the ex-Franciscan developed from it was broader than that of Luther. Straying beyond the Presbyterian lines, Lambert diverged into the Congregational scheme. He placed the bishop or pastor at the centre of his plan ; but he gathered round him, as his associates in government and fellow-rulers of the flock, not a select body chosen by the congregation, but the whole members of the Church, all of whom were presumed to be saints and holy men. This assembly or convention was to meet every Sabbath for the adjudication of causes, and the correction or exclusion of offenders. "The minister was by no means to excommunicate or absolve by himself, but only in conjunction with the congregation." This, so far, was the Congregational polity, but an arrangement was added fitted to secure for the plan the solidity and combination which Presbyterianism confers. For the superintendence of the general affairs of the Church of Hesse, provincial synods were appointed, composed of all the pastors of the province, with a deputy from every congregation.

This was a remarkable plan when we take into account the early

period at which it was brought forward, and the fact that its author had no precedents to guide him in the framing of it. He walked by the light of great principles alone. It was inferior to the plan which Calvin's constructive genius afterwards elaborated, but not greatly so. The church constitution of Hesse, however, did not long continue to exist. After being in operation for about two years, it was made to give way to the laxer politics of the Saxon churches by which it was surrounded.

Zwingle, one of the most clear-sighted and practical of all the reformers, devised for the churches of Switzerland a plan which may be said to be intermediate between that of Luther and that of Calvin. He began by framing a code of laws for the government of the Swiss people in all their more important duties, whether as citizens or as church members. The execution of these regulations he committed to certain tribunals or judges which he called into existence for that purpose. The first was the Kirk-Session, named the *Still-stand*; the second was the Provincial Synod; and the third was the Board of Moral Control. The Kirk-Session met every Sabbath after sermon. When the minister had dismissed the congregation the elders remained standing around him—hence the name by which the court was known, *Still-stand*—and in that posture they made their communications to the pastor, heard and adjudicated causes, and admonished or suspended from church fellowship those who had fallen into scandal. This seemed a quite adequate provision for the government of the congregation, and was conformable to early scriptural precedent. The *Still-stand* was supplemented by the Provincial Synod, which was charged with the oversight of the pastors, taking strict and special cognisance of the soundness of their doctrine and the purity of their morals. The Board of Moral Control had a wider jurisdiction. It embraced in its scope the repression or punishment of grosser evils—such as drunkenness and profane swearing—and generally concerned itself with those great duties which, though neither strictly civil nor strictly religious, enter vitally into the well-being of a people. This tribunal was composed of pastors and magistrates.

The weak point of Zwingle's scheme of church discipline was the predominating voice he gave to the Senate or Town Council of Zurich in the matter. The kirk-session might pronounce sentence of *temporary* excommunication upon an offender, but sentence of final and permanent excommunication the town council only could pronounce. This lodged the power of church discipline substantially in the State, for in this way the council became the highest judicatory and court of final resort. Zwingle, no doubt, took precautions, as he believed, for the right and lawful exercise of that power by the State; he handed over this power to the magistrates on the express condition that they should be Christian men, who would take the Word of God for their directory in all their decisions. And, further, it is not difficult to understand what led Zwingle to adopt this questionable arrangement, the danger of which can

be far more clearly perceived now than it could possibly be in his day. The Senate of Zurich had stood by him and enabled him to carry through his reformation. The preservation of that reformation appeared safer in the hands of the magistrates than in those of the people. They were the men of the greatest piety as well as of the greatest wisdom and zeal in the community, and advantage was likely to accrue from joining with the pastors and elders a body of men whose experience taught them patience in examining and impartiality in judging; whose firm minds were not likely to be swayed by prejudice or by popular clamour; and whose station in society would give weight to their decisions. So, doubtless, did Zwingle reason. But the Reformer of Switzerland, with all his sagacity, as comprehensive as it was penetrating, forgot that grave, learned, and pious men cannot infallibly perpetuate their kind, that the sons may be very unlike their fathers, and that whereas institutions are permanent, men die.

We come at last to Geneva, where, under the presidency of Calvin, the Presbyterian form of church government which has been so generally adopted by the Churches of the Reformation was destined to find its full and complete development. This, however, is to be understood with certain modifications. There is no question that the great chief of the Reformation mastered the principles on which Presbyterianism is based, and clearly saw the limits within which it is to be exercised and over which it must not pass, and traced out these with a master's hand; but when he set his *ideal* aworking he found that it was impeded and hampered by the theocratic constitution of the Genevan State. "A Church cannot hold together," said he to the Senate of Geneva a few days after his return from banishment, "unless a settled government should be agreed on, such as is prescribed to us in the Word of God, and such as was in use in the ancient Church." In pursuance of this avowal, and with the consent of the council, he instituted four orders of men for the instruction and government of the Church—the pastor, the doctor, the presbyter or elder, and the deacon. We have here four titles, but strictly viewed only two offices, those of the presbyter and deacon. The ministers of the city and twelve laymen formed the consistory. It met every Thursday, and wielded supreme authority over all causes, ecclesiastical and spiritual, disposing of them finally. But at this point began the complication. Geneva was a theocracy; the laws of the Church were the laws of the State, having been freely accepted as such by the people of Geneva. This made the same offence a breach at once of Church law and of State law, and this again set in motion a two-fold process. The offender had to appear before two sets of tribunals, and be subjected, it might be, to two condemnations. The consistory visited him with its spiritual censures, but forbore all civil punishment, which it had no power to inflict. The State awarded against him its civil deprivations, withdrawing his rights as a member of the theocracy, or, if the council chose not to take the same view of the matter as the

consistory, it acquitted him of the charge on which the Church had condemned him, it recognised him as still a citizen of the theocracy, and, by doing so, it virtually reposed him as a member of the Church. In this way collisions would occur at times between the two authorities. In theory there was a spiritual domain and a civil domain, and each authority was supreme within its own domain; but the theocracy, in point of fact, obliterated this division, it made of the two but one domain—for Church and State in Geneva were one—and this rendered it impossible that the working of the two authorities in what was really one domain should at all times be harmonious and consonant.

There was one point of church discipline which no threat or consideration could induce Calvin to surrender, the power even of admitting to, or of excluding from, the Lord's table. This he held to be the key of the position as regarded church government. He that wields this power holds in his hand that on which depends the purity, the well-being, nay, the very existence of the Church. When he had said to an offender, "At this table you cannot sit," the whole power of the Senate of Geneva could not induce him to put into the hands of the excommunicated the sacred "bread" and "cup." How valorously he waged battle for the purity of the communion table, and the absolute right of the consistory as regarded admission to it, is well known. Neither the threats of the council, which hung the menace of a second banishment over his head, nor the brandished swords of the libertines who pressed tumultuously around him in the church of St. Peter on Sabbath, the 3rd of September, 1553, could induce him to give the supper to Philip Berthelier, whom the consistory had excommunicated. Here was the principle of the independence of the spiritual authority vindicated and maintained—maintained at the peril of life, and what is more instructive, maintained under a theocracy, where, if anywhere, it might have been excusable in the Church to defer to the orders of State. But it is to a wider arena than the Genevan State, and to countries where no theocracy made inevitable the blending of things sacred and civil, that we must turn for the full and fair exhibition of Calvin's plan.

In France, the throne and the Protestant Church stood sufficiently apart. There, verily, there was no theocracy, at least no Protestant theocracy, and there the organisation of Calvin was more perfectly developed, and there it worked more freely and vigorously than even in Geneva. The whole array of Presbyterian Church courts, from the consistory up to the National Synod or Assembly, was there set up, and continued to work alongside the civil power, and to govern in all things spiritual the then numerous and flourishing Church of France. Scotland offered a finer field than even France on which to make trial of the Presbyterian plan of church government. In Scotland the Reformation did what it failed to do in France, it carried the nation with it, and yet it did not absorb the nation as a distinct civil body as in Geneva. There remained in Scotland a broad and palpable distinction between Church and State :

the members of the State were not necessarily members of the Church also ; and there was an equally broad and palpable distinction between the authorities which regulated respectively the affairs of each. The series of law courts, and the series of church courts as constructed and set aworking by Knox, rose side by side, wielding jurisdiction in the same country, but not in the same domain. They are seen as two distinct and independent *autonomies*. Only at those eras of our history when the prelatie spirit on the one hand, or the Erastian dominancy on the other, has broken out and struggled for supremacy, has there been any clashing of jurisdictions, or any interruption to the harmony with which the church courts from the Presbytery up to the Assembly have exercised supreme government in all things spiritual, as the law courts with equal efficiency and supremacy have done in things temporal. Recent well-known events have only helped to bring out in stronger relief than before the essential and ineradicable distinction between the spheres of the two, and the thoroughness with which all the interests of a people may be promoted when the two powers work together, and yet maintain their independence of one another, while all the time each is careful not to encroach upon the prerogatives of its co-equal by abiding scrupulously within the limits of its own domain.

What labour it cost to organise the government of the Church ! We see the great minds of the sixteenth century toiling at the work, groping along amid uncertainties and difficulties, carefully searching for principles and precedents, each profiting by the labours of his predecessor, building on what another had laid, and so advancing the work a further stage. In the course of long years only is the edifice completed. The lifetime of a single generation sufficed to recover the doctrine of the Church—for to the luminous expositions of truth in the writings of Calvin and other reformers nothing that is absolutely new has since been added, nor is ever likely to be—but it required a century to develop the plan, and, some will perhaps say, other two centuries to perfect the working of Presbyterian Church government ! Surely it is not the part of wisdom to hold as of little practical value, or to be ready to abandon, either in whole or in part, what it cost the labour of so many men and the experiences of so many years to construct. Nor will our duty in this respect seem less when we reflect on the importance of a pure, vigorous, and scriptural government to the well-being of the Church as shown in the partially ruinous condition of those Churches which had the misfortune to be put under a lax and imperfect code of discipline, contrasted with the comparatively flourishing estate of those Churches which had the happiness to enjoy a stricter and more complete ecclesiastical *régime*.

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

LET us consider what this attitude ought to be from the Catholic Presbyterian point of view. We shall thus be relieved from any discussion of questions which belong to English national policy—*e.g.*, the relation of the Church of England to the Crown and Parliament, and the project of disestablishment. We also rise above ecclesiastical comparisons of a merely local character. It must be confessed that Presbytery in England, though gaining strength, is still numerically too weak to make its bearing toward the great Prelatic Church of the country a matter of much consequence. But if we survey Protestant Christendom, we find no such disparity; our Churches are not unevenly matched, and the relations subsisting between them are of no small importance to the Protestant Christian outlook.

If, in pursuing this subject, we are obliged to come to something very like a vote of "no confidence" in the Anglican Church as it exists, we trust that no such general stricture or estimate will be construed as discouraging pleasant personal relations between the ministers and people of those Churches. We must deal with systems and institutions strictly, but with individuals gently and charitably. Just and generous men, wherever we find them, are to be honoured and loved. There is no need to dwell on this. The Presbyterians are sometimes charged with being cold and cautious; but whatever their defect of manner, they feel as deeply as any the obligation to cherish friendly and even fraternal relations with all, under every administration of the Church, who love and serve "their Lord and ours."

Even in regard to the Church of England as an institution, we have nothing to say at variance with respect. Nay, if the expression has a frigid tone, let us say kindly respect. An intelligent Presbyterian cannot be expected to regard the Church of England as a superior, or to accord to its dignitaries any homage which he would not pay to the presbyter-bishops of his own communion. But, at the same time, the intelligent Presbyterian will never be found to assail or depreciate that Church in the peevish spirit of a sectary. We are not a people who, having left an old family mansion in discontent, cry out against it because it retains useless antique decorations, and has not "all the modern improvements." We consider our house to be as old as that of our Anglican friends, though its style is less ornate; and being conscious of faults in our own dwelling, and busy with our own repairs and extensions, we can make allowance for many things that seem to be amiss in the venerable mansion over against us. It is true that we have criticised each other's systems sharply enough in the past; but men have come to care very little for mere controversial fencing between

ecclesiastical swordsmen, and we should feel ashamed of ourselves if any remembrance of provoking words should make us even reluctant to acknowledge the merits and services of a great historical Church.

The ecclesiastical feeling of a Presbyterian living in England is, in some respects, peculiar to himself. He is a Nonconformist to the ritual ordained by the Crown and Parliament, but this does not weaken his consciousness of being a "Churchman." He does not understand why his position should be emphasised as that of "a Dissenter." Though his ecclesiastical ancestors in England were driven from the Establishment for nonconformity, his Church, largely considered, did not originate in any mere revolt or secession from the Church of England; and he declines and even disdains to be churched or unchurched by his assent to, or dissent from, the State-recognised Anglican system. Jibes about sects, and little Bethels, and Bethesdas go past him unheeded. The bitterly unfair and wonderfully superficial account of Presbyterianism and Calvinism in a work so much considered as Canon Curteis's Bampton Lecture on Dissent,* stirs in his mind a feeling of astonishment that a writer so prejudiced should expect to conciliate any one, but it causes no very serious discomposure. He knows that his own Church ground, both in Scripture and in history, is good and strong enough to let him keep his temper, and weigh, without ill-will or jealousy, the claims and services of others.

Canon Curteis makes the ludicrous assertion that the establishment of Presbyterian order in England in the seventeenth century, involving "union with the best Reformed Churches on the Continent," a calamity averted "through the agency of the Independents," "would long before this time have cast back the majority of the English people into the arms of Rome." And we have ourselves met with men—sane enough on other subjects—who insist upon it, that if any change were made at the present day seriously affecting the Church of England, a flood of Popery would, unhindered, overflow the land. So long lingers among us the notion, never very well founded, and now, alas! quite fallacious, that the Church of England is the great bulwark of Protestantism.

On the other hand, however, we must not forget that within the pale of that Church lies a large proportion of the Protestantism and of the Christian worth of the Anglo-Saxon people. It has great traditional influence, and has through generations entwined itself with the social life of England. The gradations of dignity in its ministry suit a country which is perhaps further than any other from accepting the idea of human equality. Its parochial system diffuses its power over every inch of English ground. Its new district churches, rapidly multiplied in populous towns and cities, keep it abreast of the exigencies of the time; and these churches are often worked with an energy which Nonconformists cannot surpass, and are the centres of benevolent agencies pervading large sections of society. Then, the long-privileged position

* Bampton Lecture for 1871, pp. 44-50.

of the Church at the ancient seats of learning, its control of the higher education (for superior schools in England have been almost as exclusively in clerical hands as those on the Continent), and its connection with the public service on land and sea, give to it almost an unbroken sway over the upper classes of the English people. We take pleasure in adding that good fruits appear. Within the Anglican pale are produced and nourished an unfeigned piety, a sweet reverence, and much diligence in good works. If the fruit comes short of what might be expected, is it not so with all our Churches? There is enough to give the Church of England a strong hold on the affections of its own members, and a claim to respectful appreciation on the part of outsiders like ourselves.

We are all the more favourably impressed when we stretch our view to other parts of the British empire, and to the United States of America. The Anglican communion is virtually, though not formally, one and the same over all these regions, as was sufficiently indicated by the recent assemblage of prelates under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is proved that this form of the Church of God can adapt itself to new as well as to old conditions of society, and can live and propagate itself without, quite as well as with, the support and preferential favour of the State.

Such facts we recognise without grudging. Why, indeed, should we be suspected of an "evil eye"? Have we not obvious grounds of sympathy with the Church of England?

(1.) There is the historical ground. The old relations of the sixteenth century between the Anglican and other Reformed Churches must not be quite forgotten. We are glad to refer to an able and timely article in the *Quarterly Review* of October, 1878, in which it is shown that by many authoritative acts, and by the voices of her greatest divines, the Church of England has recognised the validity of ministerial orders and of sacraments in the Presbyterian Church, and that she "is fully committed to sympathy with Protestantism, and to union with the great foreign Protestant Churches." It is proved that even the High Churchmen of former times acquiesced in this, however their modern representatives may forget or be ashamed of it. We fear that this is little more than an uncertain tradition to a large proportion of the clergy of the present day. Very few, indeed, so far as we are aware, would agree with the learned and candid Dr. Jacob in urging upon his Church "a union or close alliance with the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, and with other orthodox Protestant bodies, Episcopal or Presbyterian, on the Continent, and in other parts."* But let us not forget "auld acquaintance," or discourage men like Dr. Jacob, who desire to revive it. Are not we the heirs and representatives of such fathers as Calvin, Bullinger, and Knox, who were warm friends and wise counsellors of the Church of England?

(2.) There is a considerable measure of ecclesiastical similarity between

* "Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament," by G. A. Jacob, D.D., 2nd ed., p. 336.

us. We have collectiveness and cohesion. The Presbyterian Church indeed has a firmer organisation and stronger government than the prelate; but happily it more effectually guards against clericalism, and protects the rights and liberties of the Christian people.

To Episcopacy or superintendence as such we can have no objection. We believe in it; we require it. It is obviously essential to the safety and efficiency of any combined system wrought by men. Nay, we approve of such superintendence being exercised over the Church and all its officers by districts or dioceses; the only practical question on the point between the prelatists and ourselves being whether this oversight should be entrusted to one clergyman called the Lord Bishop, or to a board of presbyter-bishops called the Presbytery. Indeed, our fathers, both in Scotland and in England, were willing to have, besides the Presbyteries, individual Superintendents, much as the Wesleyan Methodists have district chairmen: but Prelates as a superior order, successors in office to the apostles, and princes over the Church, our fathers would never admit. Neither can we admit them; and it is distinctly on this point of Prelacy, not on that of Episcopacy or superintendence, that we differ from the Church of England.

(3.) There is also some ground of sympathy in respect of the safeguards placed round public religious teaching and worship. Churches which are collectively constituted must needs have some implicit declaration and test of doctrine. So all the Reformed Churches prepared and issued Confessions of Faith, and the Church of England has her "Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion." It is always a satisfaction to us to think of the almost perfect consonance of those Articles on the fundamental points of faith with the various Confessions to which the Catholic Presbyterian Church adheres.

Moreover, under both the Prelatic and the Presbyterian systems a certain control of public worship is lodged in the hands of church authorities. The Church of England, indeed, has laid, and continues to lay, so great stress on uniformity in Divine service that she has preferred to part with a large proportion of the moral and religious people of the country, under an Act of Parliament, rather than allow any deviation from the words and forms of the Book of Common Prayer. She has thus succeeded in roughly purging herself of Puritan Nonconformists; but she is not so successful in dealing with those who are altering her services in the opposite—the Ritualistic—direction. Presbyterian Churches have never taken such extreme ground on this subject. They all began their course at the Reformation with forms of common prayer, and those on the Continent, or of Continental origin, still retain them. None of them condemn liturgies, though the Scottish Church sternly refused to have one forced upon it by a Stuart king. Our Churches have always claimed that the general direction of public worship is in the hands of the Church collective, though they wisely abstain from forcing on congregations an absolute uniformity; and therefore those

that have no liturgical forms have the gentle admonition of a "Directory for Public Worship."

Having so many grounds of respect and regard for the Church of England, we now turn, rather unwillingly, to those considerations which compel us to withhold our confidence. They force themselves, however, on our thoughts. Two in particular.

1. The inveterate sacerdotalism of that Church. It is no business of ours to determine whether this has sanction in the Formularies, and if so, how much sanction. The Society for the Revision of the Prayer-Book contends that it has, and we have never seen its arguments refuted. Of course, we know that many of the clergy repudiate sacerdotalism as earnestly as any of us can do; they regret that they are called by the name "priest," and often explain that it is only presbyter *writ small*, and they refuse to call the communion table an altar. But can any one say that the Anglican Church has at any period of its history been quite free of sacerdotalism, or that there is any reasonable prospect of the Protestant force in that communion being able to cast off this priestly incubus? Is not the matter growing worse, not better, day by day? Can it be disputed that the party in advance, if not in the ascendant, at the present time is that High Church school which has always cherished a sacerdotal conception of the Christian ministry? The Ritualists, who are simply carrying into practical expression the principles of the Tractarian movement of forty years ago, may, indeed, be stigmatised as only an extreme and unmanageable section of the great High Church party; but it is a section that grows, and in an earnest period like this will probably continue to grow, for it is surely the natural development and logical exponent of the High Church spirit and the Sacramentarian theology.

We count it a significant fact that Ritualists never spring up except under a Prelatic and hierarchical system. No Presbyterian Church is troubled with them; and as to the Church of England in particular, however men may try to explain the thing as brought about by an intrusion of traitors into the Church, it is a thing which cannot be reasonably denied, that the Ritualists find enough of support in the traditions and formularies to root themselves firmly within the Anglican communion, and enough of favour with the rulers, or of feebleness in the ecclesiastical discipline, to defy all efforts to uproot them. Most certainly, the High Church party, of which they form the advanced guard, has succeeded in lifting the sacerdotal claim higher than has been known in this country since the sixteenth century,—for we do not even except the days of Archbishop Laud,—and in removing the Church of England perceptibly further than it was fifty years ago from the standpoint of the Reformation, and so from the sympathy of the Reformed Churches.

Sacerdotalists do not admit that the Presbyterian Church is a part of the Church of God. They consider its orders invalid, and its sacraments nugatory, if not impious. They are indignant that the Queen,

chief governor of the Church of England, observes the Lord's Supper in the Church of Scotland. It is obviously impossible for us with any self-respect to seek ecclesiastical relations with persons holding such views, or with a Church in which they prevail. There is no even ground on which to meet them. But it is not this which causes us the deepest concern. It is that the sacramentarian superstitions and the sacerdotal assumptions obscure the Gospel of Christ, make the salvation of the laity to depend on the performances of priests, and produce effects on family life, on education, and on public opinion, similar to those which popish clericalism has produced on the Continent—domineering over women and timid or ignorant men, and hardening the prejudices of others against all religious truth. Any one may see that since the modern spread of Ritualism in England, two kinds of men have multiplied; fanatical creatures who outdo the Ritualistic clergy themselves in decoration of churches and devising of solemn shows, and in every possible way encourage and invite a spiritual despotism; and, on the other hand, rationalists and freethinkers who, irritated by this clerical extravagance, have renounced not the Church only, but the whole Christian faith. Such has been the effect of sacerdotalism in France and Italy; and why should England escape?

This plague shows itself too in Anglican missions to the heathen. The Church Missionary Society, it is true, has a noble evangelical record, and is doing splendid work for Christ; but the older Society for the Propagation of the Gospel seems to be incurably imbued with the spirit of High Churchism, and treats non-Prelatic, non-sacerdotal missions with contumely. Now this suggests our second point of dissatisfaction.

2. The hauteur and injustice shown to English Dissenters. No one who has not lived in England can well imagine the tone assumed by the clergy and those who take the cue from them towards Dissenters or "chapel people." We speak, of course, in the general,—not meaning for a moment to deny that there are individual clergymen here and there who rise above this ungenerous temper, and show the example of an equitable and conciliatory treatment of their Christian neighbours. What we affirm is that the bearing of the Church of England, largely viewed, towards the Christian communities living on the same soil, and endeavouring to do their part in the same great Christian service of God and the country, has been, and continues to be, one of insufferable arrogance. There is an amazing want, too, of what Englishmen are said to love—fair play. The Dissenters, after a severe struggle, got relief from civil disabilities, but the Church did not help them to get it. They have got access to the universities, but the Church never helped them to that boon. They are trying now to obtain leave to bury their dead with their own burial service among their kindred and neighbours, and the clergy are all (with a few conspicuous exceptions) screaming and protesting against a liberty of burial which is fully admitted in Scotland and Ireland.

Indeed this insistence on invidious distinctions after death is one of the most irrational and provoking things one sees in England. New cemeteries, the property of joint-stock companies, are actually divided into two parts, the one consecrated ground for "Church" corpses, the other unconsecrated, in which Dissenting corpses must be laid. To give more point to this, there is usually a chapel of imposing appearance in the former division, and a plainer building in the latter. Even in things like these, every device is adopted that may serve to deepen and perpetuate a monstrous discord in society, a yawning rift between those who adhere to the Church of England and those who do not. Can any course be more unchristian and unwise?

Now the relation of Presbyterians to that Church is, as we have indicated, somewhat different from that of Congregationalists, Baptists, and Methodists; but we have been placed under disabilities with them, and we share their grievance about the burial of the dead. But even were it not so, we should none the less protest against the demeanour of the dominant Church towards those important communities of Christian people. Every act of unfairness done to them, every word of contumely thrown at them casts all our generous feelings on their side. Surely of two parties, that which holds the privileged position is the one that ought to be the more courteous and conciliatory, and can afford to be so. To us, and we claim to be impartial observers, the Church of England appears not to understand this obligation. Yet we are gravely told, that it is the only home for liberal thinkers, and for cultured and charitable spirits, while other Churches are, in contrast with it, narrow and pragmatical!*

The Presbyterian Church had its days of intolerance when all Christendom was intolerant. But it has long ceased to be open to such a charge, and it cannot approve or abet any Church which, in the end of the nineteenth century, evinces a supercilious or overbearing spirit toward other religious organisations that are able to produce quite as true and useful Christians as can be found within its own borders.

Why do we lay such emphasis on this? It is because we are Catholic Presbyterians. By the essential genius of our system, by all the theological ideas which enter into our conception of the Church, we are compelled to be, not sectaries fighting for one or two peculiarities, but Churchmen of a large type, anxious to draw together the segments of Protestant Christendom, which, through untoward events and mis-

* Hear this from a kindly pen, quite opposed to sacerdotalism: "She is so thoroughly inclusive; she is gentle and good to those who rejoice to be her children, and to those who deny all relationship to her. She is very kind even to the unthankful and the evil. The Church of England does deserve the holy name of mother."—"Present Day Papers," second series, *Mother Church*, p. 6. But in another portion of the "Present Day Papers," the Rev. Frederick Myers tells his Church, that in view of the rise and growth of Dissent, "the attitude of the penitent" becomes her. "Let the tone and temper of our bearing towards Dissent be altered."—"Catholic Thoughts," pp. 275, 376.

carriages in the past, have fallen too far apart, and longing for a wider, simpler, more generous, and more dignified formation of Christian society. We are obliged to say it plainly, while with deep regret, that the chief hindrance to such Christian combination, among those who speak the English language throughout the world, seems to us to be the Church of England, which will unite with no other, and which conciliates no other; nay, which, instead of honourably aspiring to lead the Reformed Churches, is more and more shrouding itself in the folds of a sacerdotal and superstitious reaction, and thus alienating and vexing those, like ourselves, who have had every disposition to wish it well, who recognise to the full its great historical claims, admire its immense capacities of usefulness, and are not insensible to the serene charm of its ritual. *Liberavi animam meam.*

D. FRASER.

CHRIST'S HOMAGE TO THE LAWS OF EVIDENCE.

AS Christians, we trust and revere the Lord Jesus Christ as a Divine Saviour. This is the distinctive feature of Christian belief. All systems of religion, wherever found,—and some form of religious belief is found among all nations, down even to the least civilised tribes,—recognise a supreme Deity. There is thus a common basis in all forms of religion, and Christians acknowledge that their faith has a share in all religions, and that all religions have a share in their faith. Wherever a supreme God is recognised as Creator and Ruler over all, and as Sovereign Disposer of all events, judging men according to their doings and character, there is a true religious belief in harmony with a fundamental part of Christian faith. Along with such elements of belief, there may be an admixture of inconsistent faith and practice which we repudiate as alien to the better features of belief embraced. This repudiation may proceed on grounds of reason, apart from Revelation. The Christian Revelation inculcates a pure and harmonious belief as to the nature of God. But it is distinctively a revelation of salvation to man, and a revelation in Jesus Christ, who is set forth to the view of man as “God manifest in the flesh,” appearing to provide for our deliverance by obeying and suffering unto death, in order to open “a new and living way” into the holiest.

The claim of Jesus Christ to be regarded as at once man and God,—“He that came down from heaven, the Son of man which is in heaven,”—is the outstanding feature of the Christian Revelation, requiring ample testimony in its support, and presenting reasonable ground for most searching inquiry. In proportion as Christians appreciate the grandeur of this revelation, they will show great readiness to

honour the caution, and respect the difficulties, of inquiring minds, who will not reject without solemn inquiry, and cannot rest in the Christian faith without very deliberate scrutiny of the evidence offered in support of its claims. Our Lord is our guide in such respect for deliberation and inquiry. The revelation is great, and calls for deep reflection ; the practical result promised on acceptance of it is grand beyond description ; and as the revelation concentrates in Jesus, He meets the inquiring mind with the offer of evidence, without which there could be no rational ground for faith, and no reasonable demand of it.

When the Christian Revelation is examined, evidence of its source makes up a large part of its texture, along with the truths which more properly constitute the Revelation, and which are in some measure their own testimony. And as the Revelation centres in Christ, it is characteristic of Him, as an avowed deliverer of the sinful and wandering, that He meets them as one who pays profound homage to the laws of evidence. Without scrupulous regard to these laws, no man can reasonably accept a revelation, and no teacher can reasonably or justly expect credence. This test I seek shortly to apply in the present paper. Taking the Bible as avowedly the Christian Revelation,—and concentrating attention on Christ as the central feature in this Revelation,—I desire to indicate how strikingly our Lord meets the natural demand for evidence in support of His claims. With the fourfold narrative of His life and teaching presented in the Gospels, we have His character put in a variety of lights, while His teaching is also set in varying relations, giving the reader the advantage of contemplating it from different points of view, and the more effectually estimating its value as a whole.

To us, as readers of the Bible, it is possible to distinguish the direct evidence presented by Christ to the men of His time, from the somewhat different, because accumulated and completed, body of evidence, which the closed record includes. We have fuller evidence than they ; but they had more direct lines of evidence, some of which are of necessity withheld from us. This contrast needs to be kept before our view, affording as it does a natural distinction as to available forms of evidence. One kind of evidence may be presented to eye-witnesses ; another must be afforded to those remote from the time when the events occurred. Jesus Christ showed careful regard to this double requirement.

One conspicuous feature of Christ's teaching as it stands reported to us, equally marked in His more public discourses and His more private utterances, is this, that He does not demand assent to His teaching on the ground of alleged authority on His part. He does not command belief, but invites it, and spreads out the proofs which may afford warrant for it. He affirms quite clearly power over Nature, and authority over man. All His teaching bears internal evidence of this. At the end of His first lengthened discourse,—the Sermon on the Mount,—uniformly admired in our days for its pure, lofty, and far-reaching exposition of moral truth,—“ the people were astonished at his doctrine ;

for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes" (Matt. vii. 28, 29). The token of this consciousness of authority being everywhere present in His words, it is the more deserving notice that He does not authoritatively demand belief in His words and personal claims. This is in a sense only negative testimony, and yet it is of far more than negative value, for it gives clear proof of a positive and life-long determination. His whole life, as depicted for us in the Gospels, is that of a teacher revealing truth, not that of a dictator demanding submission. His mode of teaching is that of one who must convince and persuade, if he is to succeed at all, and who can have success in no other way.

In harmony with this is the evidence of power afforded to those who were eye-witnesses of His deeds. These forms of evidence He presented in great profusion in course of His public ministry. The miracles are, indeed, evidences for all time; but their highest value was attained during His life on earth. The cure of the paralytic was an express test of Christ's power to forgive sins, and it had its great importance in the circumstances in which it was performed. So it was with the stilling of the tempest, the feeding of the five thousand, the raising of Lazarus, and many other examples of His power. These were impressive evidences of Divine power exerted at will. There are, indeed, some who deny the possibility of miracles. They wish proof of the Divine in the world, but they affirm that it must be altogether human in form. The request is irrational. Men who deny the supernatural, attempting to foreclose the question, must submit evidence to support their negation. But, if there is to be evidence of the Divine presence, it must be evidence of the supernatural, not a mere repetition of what is within the compass of man. If Christ be in person more than man, His life must be higher than human; if He be the representative man,—“the Son of Man,”—it must also be essentially human. And it was both. These miracles of our Saviour are the imprints of the Divine hand in direct contact with human frailty and woe. But again, it is said, exhibition of mere power or force cannot establish truth. Assuredly it cannot. Twenty horse-power increased periodically by arithmetical progression for an indefinite time, and doing all the work it can throughout each period, cannot prove that justice is right, which nevertheless is a truth needing no proof. But the Lord in His miracle-working does not manifest overmastering and overawing power. When people ask signs in the heavens, no signs are given them. But when suffering men ask help, it is forthcoming. There is all the difference possible here between mere exercise of power, and power exercised in adaptation to the wants of human life. When Christ gave evidence that a Divine Saviour was on the earth, it was such that love to suffering humanity was the prominent fact. The power itself was veiled under robes of love. Accordingly, the first impression made on those who felt His power was the benefit wrought; the first result was gratitude; and only afterwards came wonder at its mode of manifestation. The

only exception is the destruction of the barren fig-tree, and that also was a moral lesson in harmony with the analogies between human life and the vegetable kingdom. That to which the history of Christ's works bears witness is, that the Lord of Nature utilised the laws of nature in order to illustrate the truth that human life is the greatest thing in nature, and most cared for by God. In strict harmony with this we find Him say to His disciples, ere He passed away from the earthly scene, "Greater works than these shall ye do, because I go to my Father," and the fruits of gospel-preaching from the day of Pentecost till now afford the slowly unfolding interpretation of His words,—Christ living and reigning unseen, and men living through Christ in the exercise of a higher life.

I have said that the miracles were more directly evidence for the men of Christ's day; but His *words* carried the central body of evidence even for them, as for us, so that the miracles were only the accompaniments of His words,—in fact, a subordinate set of words, intellectually and morally harmonising with the spoken discourse. They were illustrations easily appreciated, and certain to be remembered. Hence in His appeal to His hearers for belief of His message, He closely associates His words and works. "Believest thou not that I am, in the Father, and the Father in Me? the *words* that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in Me, he doeth the *works*. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me: or else believe me for the very *works'* sake" (John xiv. 10, 11). The combination of words and works, as both possessing credential value, is most natural, for the works were such plain evidences of saving love (and the curse of the barren fig-tree must not be excluded here), that they were the outcome and expression of a *Saviour's* life, before He advanced, according to the higher necessity He recognised, to seek a higher life for man by His own surrender to death. When that darker and more mysterious part of His work was to be done, His miracle-working came to a close, as these works were but an intervening help in the midst of life's troubles, while His death was to provide, and proclaim to the ends of the earth, life spiritual, life ever-enduring, through a Saviour who in dying received gifts for men. When that brief eclipse of death came, the tokens of a Saviour's love survived Him,—they lived in many family circles, keeping bright and strong the recollection of the love of Christ. The home at Bethany where Lazarus abode was not the only one where many were reminded of a Saviour's doings (John xii. 9). Upon the still more precious and enduring inheritance of words He left behind, I do not dwell as yet, for I shall speak afterwards of that inheritance, when considering the forms of evidence equally powerful for men of all times.

Besides the marvellous works of Christ, there is additional proof of His homage to the laws of evidence in the manner in which He dealt with inquirers, whether among those who still hesitated as to belief, or those who were numbered among His disciples. Rightly to estimate

the manner in which He gave proof of His knowledge of the human heart, and of the things of God, we must notice how many instances there are of interviews, more public or more private, expressly to deal with matters of evidence. There are at least fourteen such examples, without including a case like that of the woman of Samaria, or those cases in which men came to Him with the inquiry,—What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? The following are specimens:—Andrew and John, full of interest, saying, “Where dwellest thou?”—Nathanael with his doubts about a Nazarite origin;—Nicodemus coming under cover of night;—the scribes and Pharisees with their suppressed murmuring, “Who is this that forgiveth sins also?”—the same objectors murmuring and saying, “This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them.” Again, He does not marvel at an inquiry sent even from John the Baptist, publicly putting the question,—“Art thou he that should come, or look we for another.” He does not resent it; but says, “Go ye, and tell John what is being done in love to the suffering, along with preaching of the Gospel to the poor.” And when the messengers had departed, who had been sent to Him with that question, instead of condemning the doubt which it expressed, He says,—“There is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist.” Whether we regard the incident as indicating the presence of doubt in the mind of the forerunner himself, or take it as illustrating John’s mode of dealing with doubt in the minds of those who still continued his disciples and shrunk from avowing themselves disciples of Christ, the value of Christ’s mode of dealing with the inquiry is the same. The latter view I incline to think the correct one; but, on either alternative, our Lord illustrates His prompt and scrupulous regard to the inquirer’s natural request for adequate grounds of belief. This stands out as one of the most impressive examples of the Saviour’s sympathy with the soul’s search for truth.

For those who contemplate the evidence for Christ’s divinity at a time remote from His appearance on the earth, the form of evidence is different. As the evidence of sight is denied, the fuller evidence of complete teaching and work is granted. The Revelation is put into our hands, we are allowed and urged to search it for ourselves,—and it is so constructed as to afford special facilities for a critical investigation of its contents. The evidence of the Revelation is within itself; and the evidence for Christ is the evidence of the Revelation which makes known the facts of His life. Even if we restrict our study to the fourfold narrative of His doings, we have ample materials for testing the claims of Scripture. The life of Christ regarded merely as a narrative is an outstanding fact in literature which has nothing to approach it. No marvel that the critical spirit has assailed it from every point. The life challenges criticism, and it rewards study.

If we begin with the miracles of Christ, as the outermost circle of evidence,—the evidence specially provided for eye-witnesses who were able to test the preceding history of the persons benefited, and equally

to ascertain the results,—we shall see how rich they are in evidential value to those who are only readers of the narrative. While each one of them was a wonder to the beholder, the record of it is a lesson for the reader. The chain of miracles is not a mere chain of wonders. On the contrary, if we gathered together the separate portions of narrative which include some phase of the miraculous, and put them together for ourselves, we should find in our hands a most affecting narrative of tender compassion, openness to appeal, readiness to help, and discriminating regard to cases of long-continued or specially aggravated suffering. We should see one before us continually doing good,—living for the sake of relieving suffering,—and while bringing deliverance from it, always carrying a more precious boon, deliverance from sin, and encouragement in holiness. Controversy as to the possibility of our knowledge of the supernatural, or the possibility of a miracle, is wide of the mark in presence of such a narrative. There is a life throbbing here which speaks to the intelligence and the heart of humanity. The narrative in its simplicity is more powerful to sway the intellect than the most acute discussions about impossibilities ; just as the evidence of the senses has been potent in swaying the intelligent thought of man regarding the universe, in face of the host of puzzles arrayed with utmost ingenuity as to the theory of vision. Each miracle is in reality a discourse,—as truly a parable as any of the chosen scenes of life which the Saviour has adapted for purposes of instruction,—a lesson of Divine compassion showing a Divine provision for human sorrow. In none of the narratives is there anything to suggest a desire for popular effect,—an appeal to wonder,—or inclination to exult in a passing surprise. When a miracle of healing is performed, it is in every case the man's heart, and not merely his body which is aimed at, along with deeper instruction for the people, not gratification of their love of the marvellous. Often there is imperative demand for silence as to what has been done ; never a wish to have the matter published abroad. But when such silence is imposed, there is careful regard to the necessity for evidence. If a leper is forbidden to noise abroad his cure, he is told to go to the priest, and present his offering of thanksgiving publicly in the temple. If a poor demoniac, dwelling among the tombs, is rescued from his bondage and desires to follow Jesus, he is forbidden ; but at the same time he is instructed to go back to his home from which he had been driven forth, and tell what great things God had done for him. While, then, the miracles had their full value as signs to those who were eye-witnesses of their performance, or of their immediate results, they have evidential value for all ages in the instruction which they carry within them. And this instruction is fully gathered only by those who are at a distance from the time of their performance, and able to interpret them in sight of the completed work of the Saviour by whom they were wrought as contributory to the evidence of His mission.

But the most searching test of any revelation is its bearing on moral

life. This is the common test for all teachers, and the evidence it affords is of equal value for all time. It is not merely the personal life which is here subjected to test, though that is of primary importance ; but it is the whole range of teaching, and the entire extent of influence which it is fitted to exert. This proceeds upon the inevitable subjection of all teaching to the test of intelligence and conscience. And to this test Jesus not only submits all that He Himself teaches, but He trains His followers to a rigid application of it in all cases. "By their fruits ye shall know them." There can be no revelation from God which sets lightly on moral distinctions ; no such revelation which does not proclaim the subjection of all men to moral law, and show itself to be helpful for righteousness. This is the test which all men must apply in judging of any system of religion. No air of authority can be recognised which professes superiority to moral law. The end of such professed authority is unrighteousness, unsettling the foundations of authority. No intermixture of good and evil can be allowed on the plea that such admixture is everywhere in human life. We recognise the fact, but evidence of the supernatural must be evidence of superiority to the defects of nature. Even a disordered moral nature has within itself the means of deciding that the admixture of good and evil cannot have Divine approval, and certainly cannot be recognised as compatible with any utterance professing to be the voice of God. So completely is the whole teaching of Jesus in harmony with this fundamental requirement, that we hardly put the case strongly enough in saying that our Lord subjected His whole life and teaching to this test. For Him the test is no test. It is so much a necessity of the life He leads, that harmony with righteousness is an essential characteristic of it, and to lift men to a righteous life is His great aim. So far as we seek evidence, the moral test is a test *for us to apply*,—a requisite for our guidance ; but it is not as if it were a test to Him who lives a life singular in its sublime altitude, and who devotes Himself to one great work, to which He has so consecrated Himself, that He cannot be turned back from it though all His disciples should forsake Him and flee. The one distinct aim of the Revelation which we have in Jesus is restoration to righteousness. It is expressly a revelation of salvation from sin. This, and nothing but this, is given as the explanation of its existence. This, and nothing but this, is the reason for Christ appearing, entering upon a public ministry, and submitting to death. The most rigid test we can apply runs on a line identical with the purpose for which He is working. We make moral law the standard by which to judge of teaching ; He makes a perfect fulfilment of moral law the end which He seeks among men. In harmony with this, His first call to men is,—Repent ; that is, Turn from evil to the God who cannot look upon sin. His second call is,—Believe ; that is, Trust in the helping, delivering power of God as revealed in Him and by Him. His third call is,—Follow ; that is, Serve God with the heart, begin by serving, however imperfectly, and follow on

unto perfection. This is the gist of His teaching, and it is all directly along the line of that moral test we must apply in order to satisfy ourselves as to the value of any teaching which offers aid to the higher life. In aiming at man's salvation, Jesus seeks to establish a kingdom, which in one view shall be "the kingdom of God," in another "the kingdom of heaven" on earth.

Our limits prevent full development of the argument; but one or two outstanding features can be presented. *First*, as to the regulation of his own conduct. The life of Christ, altogether singular as it is in the literature of the ages, has its one distinction in its moral elevation. Each reader can judge for himself; and the general consent has already borne testimony to the moral purity of the character so as to leave no ground for doubt that the award in the future shall be as in the past. If comparisons be made, it is enough to say that the life of Christ presents no instance of appeal to Divine authority for relaxation of moral law in His own behalf,—greater latitude of indulgence for the leader than for the people,—a feature which utterly disgraces the life of Mohammed. The lines of action in Christ's life stretch all in the opposite direction,—a fulfilment of the law in forms and circumstances which seemed to others hardly required of Him,—a fulfilment which drew from His disciples a remonstrance, which He calmly turned aside, and disregarded. "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." This was His answer, and no disciple gained favour who pled for a restriction of obedience in the case of his Master.

Second, as to the purity of His teaching, we have no more searching test than the manner in which He publicly exposed the immorality of the leaders of the people. If in dealing with the maladies affecting human life, He was all tenderness; in dealing with the misconduct and misleading example of men, He was all sternness. Our age specially needs to mark the fact, and ponder its significance. With Christ there was no such thing as reservation, and guarded utterance, when dealing with the inconsistencies of those high in rank, whether in the State or in the Church. His whole words are those of a *Judge*, who tries the heart, and issues His decrees as admitting of no challenge or exception. It is the integrity of moral law which determines His decision; and He will not abate one word of condemnation when He deals with its transgression. We find no trace of a policy which seeks to stand well with those in power, by quietly shunning to condemn and expose their faults. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites." There is nothing in literature more penetrating in its scrutiny, or more stern in its denunciation, than Jesus Christ's scathing condemnation of the leaders of the Jewish people. This single division of moral evidence connected with the teaching of Christ has in it enough to afford a crucial test for the whole Bible. The development of this single line of argument would itself afford an ample summary of evidence.

I cannot close without a few words as to the method of salvation

unfolded by Christ, and the view it presents of the requirements for regaining righteousness. This is in no narrow sense, but in the grandest sense, Evangelical religion,—religion by Christ's Evangel,—by Good Tidings which angel songs celebrated at His birth,—which His own voice proclaimed, as He said,—“Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest,”—a word to which He gave far-reaching significance, touching the interests of “every creature,” by going forward to death in submission to what He recognised as the grand necessity of His undertaking,—“The Son of man *must* be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again” (Matt. xxiv. 7). The pondering of the good news of salvation by grace, and of the death of Christ as the grand necessity in the method, will show how the revelation which is in Christ Jesus goes to the very foundations of moral and spiritual need in a sinful state. It will displace, as the products of misunderstanding, the objections on moral grounds which have been offered to the view that Christ died in the room of the guilty. It will displace the allegation that Jesus was unjustly dealt with as a sinner, though innocent of sin,—showing that His recognised innocence was an essential condition at every point in His work. His own distinct declaration of the necessity for dying will be accepted as evidence here, for those who have already been swayed by the moral elevation of His life. And if we penetrate to the significance of that “*must*,” we shall see how the moral government of God is illustrated in this awful necessity, and how heartfelt hatred of moral evil is aroused, and made an active principle in the life of every one who seeks salvation by grace through faith in the death of Christ Jesus.

H. CALDERWOOD.

ENTHUSIASTIC PEOPLE.

BY A QUIET MAN.

I HAVE a great respect for enthusiastic people, but I do not get on very well with them, and I am sure they cannot be fond of me. My difficulty is this: they pour out their fervid souls at such a glowing heat that anything I may say in response seems cold as an icicle and dry as dust. I cannot get myself into tune with them; my conscience will not let me affect more than I feel; and yet I do greatly respect and admire them, and sometimes I wish I were like them. Sometimes I ask myself how I should feel if I were an enthusiast, and if I got from others the cold stiff answers that enthusiasts get from me. I know that I should be simply extinguished—drowned as under a bucket of cold water; for when I speak to any one, to instruct or move him, I cannot get on unless I seem to have his sympathy—if I think I am not sympathised with, I succumb

at once. But what a wonderful power of going on these enthusiasts have! What a knack of self-forgetfulness,—what a store of animal heat,—what a power of resisting the cold shoulder, wet blankets, and cold water to any amount! Here now is my admirable friend from Liverpool, Mr. Warmly, who attacked me in the railway a few weeks ago about that unhappy Lottery. We were substantially at one upon it, but he discharged himself on me with such impetuosity that I could not speak, because I knew that my tones of voice would be so repulsively cold. Mr. Stillburn, he said, that Lottery is the most lamentable thing I ever heard of. It is an awful slur upon Scotland. The fact is, it is so bad that it can't be allowed to go on. Do you think so? I said, anxiously and timidly. Yes, I think so, but that can only be because you and the like of you will never allow it. What, sir, have we not gambling enough already, that every man, woman, and child that can muster a pound is to be invited in the name of humanity to become a gambler? I know you Scotchmen will never allow it—never; you will not rest one instant till it is withdrawn: you will have every pulpit denouncing it, and every minister praying against it every Sunday—ay, sir, *that's* the engine—they must be got to pray against it till not a man shall have the face to stand up for it. I really agreed with him, though the lamentable case of the shareholders flitted before my mind, but I was not able to rouse myself to his pitch of enthusiasm, and when he appealed to me for a response, I was almost silent. I hated myself for it, yet I could not get up to his height, and I hardly knew what to say. But the good man took my stillness wonderfully well. I fancy he was used to such leaden hearers; he appeared to see that I was not so cold as I seemed, and might do something, and he seemed content.

I do not get off quite so easily when I encounter my ingenious friend Mr. Daniel. All his life he has been an enthusiast in prophecy. And all his life he has been eager to pour into any open ear his programme for the next stage of the world's history. The Eastern question always excites him. He has usually a passage from some of the obscurer parts of prophecy to explain every turn of political affairs. I must say the exegesis is rather loose, and the interpretation is often grotesque. I do think, too, it detracts not a little from the majesty of prophecy to apply it in a familiar way to Lord Beaconsfield or Mr. Gladstone. To me it is a great relief to turn to Isaiah, and observe, when prophecy does bring an individual man on the field, how all its grandeur and majesty are still preserved—"Thus saith the Lord, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut. I will go before thee and make the crooked places straight." There is a divine majesty in such words, which at once refutes to my mind all speculations about a second Isaiah, who lived after the days of Cyrus, and makes me indisposed to the rather vulgarising exegesis of my friend Mr. Daniel; and yet I get good from his

enthusiasm. His belief in the inspiration of the Bible is so profound. Ridiculous as his interpretations may be, there is at the bottom of his mind a remarkable faith in the Bible as the Word of God. I cannot but admire, too, his habit of searching the Scriptures, a habit which the study of prophecy undoubtedly fosters. I feel that in these respects he stands on higher ground than I do, and that it would be well for me to get up a little towards him. And yet I do not feel disposed to surrender my cautious mode of interpreting Scripture, for I am sure that the grotesque expositions of some good men and women who wish to exalt the Bible to the utmost, have the contrary effect in the eyes of the world, and tend to bring it into contempt.

But you ask me—Have you no lady enthusiasts among your friends? Yes—not a few. First, have I not that strange woman, Mrs. Staunch, a descendant of the old Covenanters, whose soul gushes with enthusiastic antipathy to the Jesuits, with whom somehow she conjoins the Spiritualists? Many is the visit I get from that earnest lady, many the harangue I hear, many the narrative and warning I am called to read. I must admit that her head is turned on the subject, and I expect every week to hear of her being in the lunatic asylum. But what a sample she is of a person absorbed and consumed by one master-idea! Her notion is, that Jesuits and Spiritualists are engaged in every direction in the most diabolical secret conspiracies, and that every untoward thing that happens is due to them. Did they did not introduce poison into the palace at Hesse-Darmstadt, she asked me when she called the other day, and destroy the good Princess Alice and her child? Did they not do the same, seventeen years ago, to her father at Windsor? Did they not try to do it to the Prince of Wales, and would they not have succeeded if the Christian people of the country had not set earnestly to pray for him, and so defeated their schemes? And that unfortunate City of Glasgow Bank, was it not they that blew it up, as they have blown up coal mines, and made ships founder, or capsize, or come into collision, and perpetrated many such things as were never heard of before our age? All this is mixed up with undoubted facts about the actual progress of Popery, and the actual efforts of Jesuits at home and abroad. “O Sir!” she appeals to me, with all the passion of her nature, “can nothing be done to save our country from these nefarious schemes?” I look puzzled, and when I speak, I speak in a cold sceptical tone. “I see you don’t believe it,” she says sorrowfully; “it’s part of their wiles to keep men like you in the dark.” Then she asks me, if I will not pray that if these things are true I may see them. I cannot say that I will, because her theories are so wild, and her ideas of cause and effect so fantastic. “Well,” she says, “if you won’t, I’ll pray for you.” Or, perhaps, she makes a tender appeal to me in the interests of my children. “You don’t know what schemes they are hatching against your own darlings. Did I not see a strange-looking foreigner at your door, and did you not give him a pair of boots?”

Rash act of charity, truly ! That man was a Jesuit-agent, a spy sent to find out how to get into your house, and you may be sure, that, with his infamous accomplices, he will one day pay you for your boots in his own coin !” Undoubtedly, this case is one of those in which enthusiasm passes into monomania. It is grotesque enough, I freely allow ; but there is something very touching in seeing such thorough devotion of heart and soul to a cause, under the guidance of insanity. I must own I am awed by the sight, and I never allow myself to speak to that woman disrespectfully or impatiently. There is not a thing she possesses that she would not give, if she thought it would stop the mischief that distresses her ; not a labour she would not undergo, not a sacrifice she would not make. Surely it is not very creditable to us that it is from crazed women like this that we, who are in the full possession of our senses, get the most vivid impression of what thorough devotion to an idea means.

But I have a much more pleasant enthusiast friend in dear old Miss McBright. The good soul is an enthusiast in kindness. When you go to see her she is entranced with delight. She is a genuine woman, and a good, with her heart in her mouth, as they say—a homely buxom face, and I was going to add, only it looks like an Irishism, her heart in the right place. She loves her Lord, and all His servants. And when “auld acquaintance” is added to this bond, her affectionateness is quite overwhelming. But what can a quiet man like me do under such overpowering demonstrativeness ? I am quite pleased to see her, but I can own to no feeling that comes within a hundred degrees of the boiling point at which her thermometer appears always to stand. In her presence I have a most uncomfortable sense of the coldness of my nature, but at the same time a cordial appreciation of the quality which I not only want, but cannot even respond to. What a happy life such a good woman must live ! Moving through rich and poor with that glowing heart of hers, and beaming face, and easy manner. And such a store of sunshine, that it prevails against all darkness and coldness, and pours itself out always and everywhere. That diffusiveness of affection, however excessive in some of its manifestations—after all, it is a truly divine quality. I feel as if it would be a great sin to check it—it would be snubbing a real Una, one who “makes a sunshine in the shady place,” and if she does not quite constrain the lion to “kiss her wearied feet or lick her lily hands,” at least she makes him, “at the sight amazed, forget his furious force.”

But enthusiastic natures are surely not meant for private life only. Enthusiasm is in its highest place when it is joined to eloquence. Allowing that enthusiastic people don’t absolutely require sympathy to draw them out, they are surely much the better for it. Now a great audience is not composed solely of quiet, old men like me, incapable in ordinary circumstances of giving back the burning emotion of the orator’s soul ; it is sure to contain a proportion of fervid and susceptible

hearts, that will kindle rapidly to his appeals, and by some mysterious process make him feel that he is setting them on fire. What a wonderful process it is, when the subtle oratorical fluid seems to dart, and play, and bound from soul to soul, and the dull clay of the human frame is transformed for the hour into a spiritual body, full of susceptibility and life! What can heavy natures like mine do under such a process, but gaze in silent wonder, till at last we too are caught by the flame, and swayed hither and thither like the youngest of the audience? It is truly a triumph of oratorical enthusiasm, when it gets hold of veterans like us, and in spite of all our natural immobility, we cheer and shout as if we had lost our senses. I think of a flooded stream that sweeps down stacks and planks and palings as if they were mere playthings, but is resisted for a long time by a mighty oak, till at last even that gives way, and then the river appears to roll on with a more triumphant air, because nothing is now left for it to conquer. It must have been a scene like this when George Whitefield prevailed over Benjamin Franklin, and constrained him to borrow a sovereign from his neighbour to give to his Orphanage. I remember hearing the late Mr. James Dodds, who wrote so well on the Scottish Covenanters, describe a famous meeting in Edinburgh, when Chalmers delivered one of his greatest speeches in favour of West India Emancipation—a speech of which Lord Jeffrey said that nothing he ever heard so completely realised his conception of the effect of the eloquence of Demosthenes. Mr. Dodds was a boy at the time, and he described how he was carried into the meeting by the dense surging crowd, till he found himself jammed in on standing ground among men tall and fat, one of whom, right behind him, used his head as a hatstand, and leaning deliberately on his shoulders, replied to the boy's silent remonstrance, "My maun, we must all learn to bear our burdens in this world." It was not a comfortable attitude for listening to speeches; but hardly had Chalmers started when Dodds forgot all his troubles, and found himself so transported beyond earthly sensations that it would not have mattered if he had had ten butchers on his shoulders instead of one.

How soon Chalmers found out the power of enthusiasm! I remember, many many years ago, at a very vital crisis, when he was concentrating his utmost powers on his task, hearing him conclude a most eloquent and moving speech with a splendid burst on the power of enthusiasm. "These," he said, "are extraordinary times; and enthusiasm is a virtue rarely to be met with in seasons of calm and uninterrupted prosperity. Enthusiasm flourishes in adversity, kindles in the hour of danger, and awakens to deeds of renown. The terrors of persecution only serve to quicken the energy of its purpose; it swells in proud integrity, and, great in the purity of its cause, it can scatter defiance amid a host of enemies." What was my surprise to find after the death of the great orator, when his posthumous works were published, that this peroration was written in his boyhood in a discourse for the Divinity

Hall ! Could he have foreseen when he wrote it, that this magical gift was to be given to him, to move his country in times of tremendous conflict ? If he had any inkling of this, how little could he have fancied that it would be used, at its very highest pitch and temper, to support and propagate those evangelical views which at that time he connected with none but ignorant fanatics !

I sometimes think it would have been worth living in the days of Peter the Hermit, to see the marvellous effects of his enthusiasm, when he roused all Europe to the Crusades. Like many enthusiastic orators, —Chrysostom, Calvin, Wilberforce, Candlish, for example—he was of spare and insignificant form, but with a quick and flashing eye, and with an impetuous, eager, hungry soul. His austerities and vigils would make his imagination active, and no doubt after he visited Palestine he was sincere in his belief that when lying prostrate, oppressed with the condition of Christians in the East, he heard the voice of our Lord Himself saying, “ Rise, Peter, go forth to make known the tribulations of my people : the hour is come for the delivery of my servants, for the recovery of the holy places ! ” A commission received under such circumstances would give him full belief in himself, and this surely is a first requisite for an enthusiast. Fancy him traversing Italy, and then crossing the Alps, seated on his mule, with a crucifix in his hand, his head and feet bare,—preaching in pulpits, in market-places, and by the wayside ; his strong natural eloquence intensified by his tears and groans and beating of his breast ; by his invocation of the saints and angels, the Virgin Mother and the Lord Himself, to bear witness to him ; and by his calling on Mount Zion, Calvary, and the Holy Sepulchre to lift up their voices and implore their deliverance from sacrilegious profanation. Having got Pope Urban smitten with his own enthusiasm, the ball was at his feet ; and with wonderful rapidity the mania spread throughout all Europe, and every man with a heart in his bosom became a crusader ! I wonder what he thought when he heard of the first disasters of the movement, and whether, after that, his own heart kept at the point of enthusiasm. It was really a wonderful thing, to have roused Europe and sent forth all its chivalry to the East ; but the upshot of the whole reminds us of the Frenchman’s remark when he saw the charge of the Light Brigade at Balaclava—“ Magnificent, but not war ! ” One remembers with pain how often the energies of great enthusiasts are misspent, and, spite of their brilliant assaults, the evil that is in the world remains unshaken.

I have a much higher appreciation of a great female enthusiast of the Middle Ages—Catherine of Sienna, whose Life has lately been given us by one of the most admirable women of our time—Mrs. Josephine Butler, of Liverpool. The daughter of a working dyer, with no outward help or resources of any kind, but with marvellous purity of soul, horror at sin, zeal for the honour of her Lord and His Church, and faith in Him as the hearer of prayer and the helper of His servants, she rose to a place

of almost superhuman power in those dark and troubled times. The Pope and his court had been absent from Rome for a number of reigns, living at Avignon, and revelling in all the luxury and looseness of the French society which kept them there. The dyer's daughter was shocked to think that the shepherds of the Lord's flock should be so unfaithful to their Master. It was a very evil spirit for a young girl to cast out—the demon of merry living and sensual pleasure, and out of men, too, that were by no means easy to be dealt with, and that resented, with terrible wrath, any inroad on their enjoyment or any charge of unfaithfulness. But Catherine conquered—conquered through faith and prayer,—broke up the court at Avignon, and brought back the Pope to the Vatican. Not much over thirty when she died, she exemplified the triumph of true devotion over all disadvantages and obstacles; she showed what can be done by enthusiasm,—inspired, sustained, and directed by the power of God.

Though I am a quiet man, I have a great admiration for enthusiasm. I know it has often hard lines. People say it is indiscreet. No doubt this is true; but full well it pays for that drawback. I think very ill of those who make it the subject of bitter or of scornful laughter. I can remember in my younger days a gentleman who was the one enthusiast of a large and very phlegmatic town, and it was the universal amusement to run him down. Enthusiasm is a Divine gift, and by no means a common one. Wherever it is found, it should be prized and cared for. Its eccentricities should be readily pardoned, if, on the whole, its purpose is good and its methods reasonable. And if its methods are not reasonable, the effort of all wise and good men should be to improve its methods. But let us have a care of the thing itself. Enthusiasm is not a thing of human manufacture. It cannot be made to order at Universities or Divinity Halls. It cannot always be combined with a regulation allowance of learning, or of wisdom, or of knowledge of the world. It implies, to begin with, a certain physical temperament, a quickness of nerve, and perhaps other forces more subtle than we know how to describe. Christian enthusiasm implies the touch of a live coal from off the altar, the touch of a spear more potent than Ithuriel's, and the sustained communication of that power by which the eye of faith is kept open, and the heart-strings are kept throbbing with love for souls and zeal for the Saviour. It is not, therefore, to be dismissed with a sneer or a scolding. It is to be accepted as it is sent, to be used for the ends for which it was given, and tenderly dealt with when it becomes irregular or eccentric; dealt with on the ground that, if drawn into a more orderly orbit, it will become a blessing—if scornfully repelled, it may become a curse.

I know it is said, and I have often said it myself, that enthusiastic people must be more or less men of one idea, and must exaggerate that idea. People ask me,—“Don't you stand up for balanced and complete views of things, and rather pride yourself, in a quiet way, that there is no exag-

generation about you? Then why this sneaking kindness for men of one idea, and often of monstrous exaggeration?" But in point of fact, as the world goes, the idea which they exaggerate gets toned down to very ordinary proportions before it reaches the masses. I like proportion in a building; but if I am to have a cross on the top of St. Paul's, it must be an enormously large one, in order that, under the toning influence of distance, it may appear the right size when seen from the street. A man who exaggerates a favourite but true view is no doubt himself liable to suffer from his mental habit. But people around him are not so liable. Before the idea reaches their minds, it has probably come down to its own place in the proportion of things. Some additional force must be given to a great truth to overcome the *vis inertiae* of the human soul, and secure for it admission to that well-guarded citadel.

Now the upshot of all these musings of mine is, that I think we quiet men would all be the better of a touch of enthusiasm. Though Michal should laugh at us, it would be well for us sometimes to be in the mood of dancing before the ark. We keep these emotions of ours so desperately quiet—like tame rabbits in their hutch. Would it not be well if our feelings were sometimes set on fire? Yes, *set on fire*,—the image is *not* too strong. The proverb says truly, "Fire and water are good servants, but ill masters." Now, I don't want the flaming heart to be the master, but the servant. I want it to be guided by the reason and controlled by the conscience. But I want it, at the same time, to have a little more activity and a little more force than it often has. The *perfidum ingenium* with which Scotchmen are traditionally credited is not, after all, a very common temperament. Surely we might all with advantage lay ourselves open to influences that would rouse us and warm us more. I think there would be more Christian enthusiasm if these two texts had more scope among us—"The love of Christ constraineth us;" "They that wait on the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary, and they shall walk and not faint."

GENERAL SURVEY.

It is a curious fact that while the cubic contents of our globe have never changed within the human period, its size has changed very much for practical purposes. Under Columbus, it increased enormously; but when the telescope was invented, and the place of the earth in relation to the universe ascertained, it seemed to shrink to nothing. Under modern geographical discoveries in the south, it appeared again to swell; but steam and the telegraph have made it contract into smaller apparent bulk than ever. People talking about our globe remark now what a compact little world it is. Scoundrels can hardly find a spot to hide in. Whatever is going on at one side of it, can be known in a few hours at the other. Even travelling has ceased to be tedious; the bishop from the north-west of Canada, who took a year to travel from his diocese to the Anglican Synod, is about the most singular phenomenon in our locomotive age. It is the era of increasing cities, but of dwindling distances. The telegraph seems to have accomplished the tale of its wonders; we only wait to know what the telephone can do.

It is natural to ask, to what does all this tend? What influence will it have on the true welfare of the world? Will it advance or will it hinder the progress of the Gospel? Will it hasten or retard the brotherhood of mankind?

It is easy to see that it will have some effects by the very nature and necessity of the case. More intercourse with the various parts of the world will produce more likeness among their inhabitants. There will be more infiltration of mutual qualities; more knowledge of what can be obtained from each country; more acquaintance with the arts and products of each. In particular, the dominant races of the world will exercise a growing influence on the weaker, and probably become more powerful than ever. Among civilised nations there will be exhibitions of industry, translations from each other's literature, lending to each other samples of their art treasures, letting each other hear their *Prima Donnas*; and less pleasant perhaps, keen competition for custom in the various markets of the world. Would that we could say that by the nature and necessity of the case, there will be less war, and more forbearance and mutual consideration! And would that we could say that it is the good qualities of each race that will chiefly migrate into other races! Experience tells us too plainly that it is the reverse of this that more frequently happens; nothing spreads more rapidly than the vices of civilised nations; and even among them, through the enormous armaments which they insist on maintaining, warlike passion becomes one of the permanent forces of the age.

If any good, therefore, is to come from the practical reduction of the world's dimensions, and the near neighbourhood to each other in which its people are coming to dwell, it will not be by the necessity of the case, but by special care and effort directed to that end. It can only come from a careful cherishing of the sense of responsibility on the part of the more thoughtful and influential countries, and an earnest endeavour and prayer that the intercourse now so easy

and so common may not turn to evil but to good. The spirit of Christian love must be directed to all the races now brought so near; for no other spirit will effectually advance their welfare. If anything is made plain by history, it is this, that a civilisation founded on mere selfishness does not work out the true good of communities. Only such love as that of Christ will really prove a blessing. And it is only under the wing of the Christian Church that such a love can be born and bred.

Here, then, is an aim for the Churches of our Alliance. Let the pulpits throughout all our borders seek to promote a thoughtful regard for the welfare of all the communities now brought into easy contact, so that the intercourse which has become so common may be for good. The obligation lies very specially on the Anglo-Saxon family, which has so many connections with the ends of the earth, and is so much regarded by the feebler races. It is a comfort to think that their responsibility in this respect is much more considered by them now than in former times. But much may yet be done by the Churches to deepen this feeling, and induce both traders and travellers to act so that no country and no race to which their intercourse extends shall fail to be elevated and blessed through contact with them.

SCOTLAND.

A VERY widespread evangelistic movement has taken place in Glasgow, shared, in various proportions, by the three Presbyterian Churches. A mission week, or week of daily evangelistic services, was held in January, more than a hundred churches being open for the purpose; and, though it is impossible with accuracy as yet to state the results, the friends of the movement are highly encouraged, and speak of it as having been in some quarters a very blessed week.

We have applied for information to the various denominations, and have received replies from the Established Church and the Free.

Dr. Marshall Lang, Convener of the Committee of the former, the successor of Dr. Norman Macleod, has thrown himself most strenuously into the movement. The presbytery not only authorised the mission but addressed a pastoral letter on the subject to the congregations within their bounds. After explaining the object of the movement, the address dwells on the great need of such a special effort, and appeals to all for help, especially heads of families, employers of labour, and owners of mills and workshops. "Our desire is that our congregations may be anew baptized with the Holy Ghost, that there may be to all a most blessed enlightenment of the eyes of the understanding, to know the hope of their calling and the riches of the glory of God's inheritance in the saints, that many may be converted to God, and that those now serving the Lord, yet wanting liberty in service, may attain to a higher stature in the Christian life, and fulness of joy in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

Various other means were taken to awaken the interest and secure the active help of ministers and others in the movement, and announcements and invitations were circulated in the localities where the meetings were held. The handbill for the group of churches connected with Dr. Lang's—the Barony—gives a list for every day, including, besides the usual Sunday services, special meetings for young men and for children, also for men, and for young women, and mothers; short afternoon services daily at 1.30 and 2 P.M. for work-people on their way to their employment at the dinner hour; mission services every night in the Barony Church, with after-meetings. Appeals to the people were made not only on the footing of the essential importance of spiritual things, but especially on the ground of the distress now prevailing, and the Divine purpose of such chastenings to lead men to secure the enduring treasures of the grace of God.

Dr. Lang, with reference to the meetings in his own church, says that the week was a blessed one to many.

From Rev. R. M. Thornton (formerly of Canada, now of Wellpark Free Church,

Glasgow) we have received some details of the movement in connection with the Free Church. It is the second mission of the kind under the auspices of that church. The approval of the presbytery was given, and upwards of eighty congregations went into the movement. The meetings, so far as announced, appear to have been limited to a nightly service in each church, and a few afternoon meetings. Handbills in tens of thousands announcing the meetings and inviting attendance were handed in from door to door. In most cases the meetings lasted a week, but in some a fortnight.

The plan of the Free Church differed from that of the Established and the United Presbyterian, in having services in every church, while the others grouped congregations in centres. Mr. Thornton says that the experience of the Free Church is, that much more effort is put forth when each congregation feels that the success of its meetings depends, under God, on its own efforts. One result of the movement in this respect has been that many office-bearers and others have been led to take a share in the work, from which shyness or timidity would have otherwise kept them back.

In the Free Church the movement followed immediately the week of united prayer, but in many cases there were special meetings for prayer before the public meetings took place.

In regard to results, there is difficulty as yet of speaking. The attendance on the whole was larger than in the previous year. The after-meetings for prayer and conversation with those in spiritual concern were large. At one meeting more than forty persons remained for conversation, many of them able-bodied men in deep spiritual anxiety. One minister mentions eighteen, another fifteen, and another twelve, and so on, as having given their names; but fuller reports will be obtained soon.

The active promoters of this work feel that it is of much importance that such attacks on the kingdom of Satan should be made from year to year, at the same time and by all denominations. It is a great matter to present a united front to the common foe, and the movement would be still more powerful if the various Assemblies and Synods recommended it, and it became an established institution. It is believed that one week is quite enough, if well employed, and that it is not desirable to prolong the work until it dies a natural death.

It is evident that the same feeling which in a former age craved a succession of "preaching-days" around the sacramental Sabbath is now taking a somewhat different turn. Perhaps these meetings may supply the solution of a difficult problem, as to whether the preaching-days should be kept up in form, when the active craving for them has abated so much. It may be found that the week of meetings will advantageously take the place of the half obsolete fast-day, and other days of preaching.

ENGLAND.

Letter from Rev. ROBERT TAYLOR, Norwood (Editor of the "English Presbyterian Messenger").

YOUR readers are no doubt familiar with the main facts in the history of the ancient and noble branch of the great Presbyterian family that at one time flourished in England. Between the malign influence of intolerant laws on the one hand, and of waning spiritual life on the other, our compact polity was gradually disintegrated into pure Congregationalism, and the scriptural orthodoxy of the Puritan fathers was dissolved into Arian and Unitarian Rationalism. With the exception of some scattered struggling congregations near the Scottish borders, and a few more in the great cities, composed entirely of Scottish immigrants, Presbyterianism entirely died out of England.

Its restoration and revival are the work of a single generation. The first Synod was constituted only a little over forty years ago; and some years later an independent and fully-organised Presbyterian Church was formed on the English soil.

The honoured name of the founder of your publishing firm, the late James Nisbet, holds a conspicuous place among the large-hearted elders—of whom some remain with us, though the greater part have fallen asleep—who took a leading share in the work of founding the English Presbyterian Church. And not to mention others among the ministers, it is not without a fresh tear, though the grass of eleven summers grows green upon his grave, that we refer to James Hamilton, as staunch and loyal a Presbyterian as he was a true-hearted and catholic Christian, and one to whose sage wisdom and saintly spirit and rich genius the little Church owed more than, perhaps, she knew, highly as she valued and loved him.

Alongside this Independent English Church were two others; the one a small body which has not been progressive in connection with the Established Church of Scotland, whose best-known minister, Dr. John Cumming, the author of many works, at one time widely popular, may still be heard in the church to which he attracted crowds in his younger and more vigorous years; the other a growing branch of the Scottish Secession, which, though running over the wall into England, yet remained an integral part of the parent tree. This latter body and the English Presbyterian Church were, after protracted negotiation, happily united into one Church in 1876, under the name of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF ENGLAND. This union works most smoothly, without discord or jar. The two bodies appear to be not only welded but fused into one; and so far no tendency whatever has shown itself, in votes or otherwise, to unite or divide, as the case may be, in accordance with the old lines of ecclesiastical separation. It will take some time yet before the united Church is completely unified in spirit and work. But the process is going on apace. A great stride has been already taken towards it on the home field, in the adoption of a uniform financial method for the maintenance of the ministry—viz., by means of a General Sustentation Fund. This fund is in its main features identical with the grand conception of Chalmers, so nobly worked out in the Free Church of Scotland; and perhaps the best illustration of its excellence is the fact that it has yielded for some years a minimum income of £200 a-year to the ministers of our Church. Of course, congregations who are benefactors to the fund—i.e., who contribute more than the equal amount drawn out by each—are free to increase their minister's salary to whatever point they please; and the incomes of our ministers accordingly range from two hundred to a thousand or twelve hundred pounds a-year.

Our Church has a good deal of the energy, and enterprise, and hopefulness of youth; and with the healthy if somewhat hard toil of holding her own and making headway among the strong currents of religious and church life in England, she has been hitherto happily free from the speculative vagaries into which, in a more leisurely condition, some men are apt to be betrayed. She is honoured to carry on in China one of the most successful missions of modern times; and she has a field for Presbyterian Church extension—in the interests not of our denomination but of scriptural truth and sound spiritual life—here in England, difficult in some respects, but full of promise to a skilled husbandry,—a field which may well inspire her enthusiasm while it overtaxes her resources and strength, and in which, therefore, she may ask the prayerful sympathy and co-operation of all the older Presbyterian Churches in the British Empire, and even in America. With your kind permission I shall gladly give some glimpses of what our Church is doing, and trying to do in England. I may be permitted to say that we hail *The Catholic Presbyterian* with joy and hope. It appears to be the very journal we require; and if we can only get it widely circulated it will help mightily to kindle and maintain among our young and scattered congregations a healthy church patriotism, that, by making them love and honour their own Church more, will make them better and more fruitful members of the great Church universal, of which Christ is the Head and all believers are living members.

THE CONTINENT.

DR. SOMERVILLE'S MISSION VISIT AND WORDS OF CHEER.

We are much pleased to learn that Dr. Somerville, of Glasgow, whose mission tours in India, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have been attended with so much good, is about to undertake a similar visit to the Continent of Europe. As in India, his immediate object will be to promote the spiritual welfare of his English-speaking countrymen; but if his visit prove the means of fresh life to them, that life is sure to communicate itself to their neighbours of other tongues. In the view of this visit, it will be encouraging to native Christians to know that not only is Dr. Somerville eagerly desirous to benefit them, but that he has an intelligent acquaintance with their varied histories, and a cordial, affectionate appreciation of the interesting features of each. We do not think we ever saw in the same compass so comprehensive a *résumé* of these points as in a recent address of Dr. Somerville's, from which we extract the following "Words of Cheer," as revised for our pages by himself:—

"Taking Continental lands, let us stretch out the hand to the Christians of queenly Lisbon, sitting by the sea; of learned Cumbra, of Oporto, on its beautiful stream,—expressing the hope that Portugal, through their instrumentality, may be won for Christ.

"Let us cheer with our assuring voice the toilers in Barcelona, Madrid, Valladolid, Santander, and Rio Tinto. Let us gladden Spain with our tokens that we do not forget Seville, with its old confessors; Granada, with its modern martyr prison; Malaga, with its New Testament and its memories of Matamoros and Carrasco.

"Let us brighten with our warmest sympathy the faithful labourers in Lyons, Paris, and other cities of France. Let us speak to them of their own Calvin, Lefevre, Farel, and Coligny; of the grand Huguenots and the heroic Camisards. Let us tell them of the cheer given us by the success of the French mission in Basutoland; let us bid them take courage, and wisely but energetically to unfurl the banner of evangelical truth through all the eighty-nine departments of their great country.

"Let us encourage by our remembrances the faithful remnant in Belgium who have testified against superstition, and are the worthy successors of those who witnessed for the truth in Brussels and Antwerp in other days.

"Let us hold out our loving arm to Christ's followers in Holland, which, in the terrible days of Philip II. of Spain, and during years after, was raised up like Samson to contend successfully for religious liberty on the Continent, and which, at the expense of her blood, proved the benefactor of Europe. Alas! through the faithlessness of those whose life-business it should be to be the 'lights of the world'—though, thank God, there are splendid exceptions—Holland to-day is more like Samson with his eyes put out. Let us grasp the hands of the true descendants of the martyr heroes of Zutphen, Naarden, and Harlem; tell them we have not forgotten the hospitality their country evinced to our persecuted Covenanters; that we think with gratitude of the labours of the Dutch mission in South Africa; and that the memory of Da Costa, Groen von Prinsterer, Capadose, and Van Loon, lately passed away, is still green with us.

"Let us have a kind word to exchange with Denmark, whence our own beloved Alexandra has come. Let us show that we have not forgotten the obligation to Denmark under which all our Indian missions lie, for the home given at Serampore, in Bengal, to Carey, Marshman, and Ward, when access was denied elsewhere, whence the Bible in forty languages and dialects issued for the instruction of the millions of our Hindoo fellow-subjects.

"Let us not overlook the little groups of Christians in the islands of the North, our own Heligoland, the Faroes, and Iceland. Let us open friendly communication with them. Iceland, with her volcano and hot geysers, has played no insignificant part in literature, distant though she be.

"Let us make our Christian signals to Gamle Norge, old Norway, and search out with kindly zeal Christ's followers in Christiania, Bergen, Thronhjelm, on to Hammerfest and the North Cape. Let us sympathise with our brethren of the Norwegian mission in their trials in Zululand, and in their triumphs in Madagascar.

"Let us send our cheerful greetings to Sweden, with its twenty-four provinces, and tell the brethren in Stockholm, Jönköping, and Gothenburg how glad we have been made by the tidings of religious revival in the land.

"Let us transmit our salutations to the Christians in Russia. Let us tell the believers in Petersburg and Moscow, and the interesting Presbyterians mentioned by Mr. M'Kenzie Wallace in his pages, that we love the Russian people, and long for the day when the

Gospel shall bless their seventy-two millions. Let us remind them that we have not forgotten the example of self-sacrifice, when the flames of blazing Moscow smote the power of the oppressor, not only of Russia, but of Europe; that we embrace with Christian affection all in Russia who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity; that we regard with deep interest the efforts of the Finnish Evangelical Mission in Ovampoland in S.E. Africa; and pray that the Spirit of God may descend on Russia's immense territory, and the Word of God course through it all.

"Let us pour the balm of sympathy into the wounds of the Christians of Turkey. Let us tell Christ's people there, that we are yearning to comfort them; that it is our hope and prayer that the sorrows and blood-shedding experienced may issue in the spreading of the Gospel of Jesus amid all the provinces and nationalities of their suffering land.

"Let us ring out a word of good cheer to Greece, and assure her that our gratitude cannot die, not merely for her ancient philosophers, orators, and poets, but because she gave such welcome to Christianity in its early days. Save for Greece we should not have had the story of Philippi and Thessalonica, embalmed as it is in the inspired page; nor should we have possessed Paul's sublime description of the gems of charity, and that of the resurrection of the just. Let us tell her that Europe waits for Greece to re-awake from her sleep of ages, and to flame in pristine brightness with the radiant light of the Gospel.

"Let us clasp the hand of beautiful Italy, robed with all her wondrous recollections. Let us extend our practical sympathy to the glorious Waldenses, to the struggling Free Churches, to the Christians of Turin, Florence, Leghorn, Rome, and Naples. Let us ask if the tinkling of the Great High Priest's golden bells is heard along the slopes of the Apennines, and if the silver trump of Jubilee is sounding over plain and hill. Let us encourage the brethren by the hope that to them it may be given, in an important measure, to dissolve the chains of superstition and imposture throughout the world.

"Let us send our messages of love to the Christians of Austria, Hungary, Moravia, Bohemia, and the Tyrol. Let us tell them that the martyr struggles and trials of the past, undergone for the truth's sake, cannot be forgotten; that we appreciate their present labour and longings; and let us exhort them to be prayerful and intrepid in the work of God.

"Let us maintain correspondence with the Christians in Prussia. Who can forget what the world owes to Luther, Melancthon, and other reformers in the old grand days? or how much the Church of Christ has benefited by Bengel, Neander, Tholuck, Krummacher, Stier, and many besides? Let us congratulate the excellent Rhenish mission on the attainment of its jubilee; tell them that we lovingly watch the progress of that mission, as well as those of Berlin and Hermannsburg in the Cape Colony. Let us indicate that we are anxiously looking to the brethren in Berlin, Breslau, Leignitz, and Rheinland, to uplift the standard of divine truth in Germany, and to diffuse scriptural Christianity throughout the fatherland.

"Let us transmit our fraternal regards to the friends of the Lord Jesus in Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Saxony, Baden, and Hanover. Let us urge those in Munich, Stuttgart, Dresden, and other cities, to take heart, to draw together, and to cherish all hope in their Divine Head for the extension of His kingdom.

"Let us bear on our affection the twenty-two cantons of Switzerland. Who can estimate the advantage Scotland derived from Zuingli, Calvin, Beza, and many more in other times? Our own Haldane has linked the two countries together in later days. The labours of D'Aubigné and Gausson have conferred on the Church at large an imperishable boon. Let us tell the Christians of Geneva, Lausanne, Neufchatel, and Berne how much we love them, and that we turn our eyes to Switzerland to do her part nobly in this crisis of Europe's spiritual history.

"Nor let us withhold our shout of good cheer from the Christians scattered over the stations and isles of the Mediterranean. Let us more especially hasten to assure the brethren in our own Gibraltar, Malta, and now Cyprus, that we eagerly expect, by their fidelity and enthusiasm, these places may become the lighthouses of the Great Sea, and make their brilliant beam to shine amid the darkness, alike on the African, Syrian, and European shores."

FRANCE

RECENT EVANGELISTIC WORK.

It is matter of thankfulness that while the past of France, in relation to the Gospel, is suggestive of almost unmitigated regret, the present gives indications of a brighter era to come. Though nominally a popish country, France is too intelligent in the main to believe in Romish jugglery. The slaughter which exterminated the Huguenots could not efface the qualities which have made the

French a really great and gifted people—too great and gifted to submit very long or patiently to such a thralldom as Rome is wont to impose in the name of holy religion. Hence, from the days of the Gallican liberties downwards, the French Roman Catholic Church has shown a disposition to exercise a freedom of thought and action exceedingly distasteful to the transmontane power, which, under specious pretexts, has ever sought to make all interests subservient to its own. And though the avowed Protestants now number only about one million (instead of eight, as they would have done ere now, with anything like fair treatment), it is certain that within the pale of the Romish Church in France there are many who are Papists in name and nothing more.

Indications are not wanting that popish superstition has now but a slender hold on large masses of the French people. Many are saying—Who will show us any good? and are being brought, in various quarters, to seek their answer, neither from Rome's false prophet, nor from the proud goddess of reason, as formerly, but from the Great Teacher, meek and lowly, who alone can give rest to their souls.

The great work that is being accomplished by Mr. M'All and his coadjutors in Paris, Lyons, and other important centres is widely known, and worthy of prayerful interest. The hopeful collateral movement, headed by M. Réveillaud, has already been brought before the readers of *The Catholic Presbyterian* by his own interesting article, which appeared in the first number. But now, as a specimen of what is quietly going forward in obscurer corners of the great French field, we wish to call attention to the work that is being done at Ferney, near the borders of Switzerland, in the department of Ain, and at Troissy, a village in Marne, situated about eighty miles east of Paris.

Ferney, about four miles from Geneva, is now the centre of an important evangelistic movement. The history of the village has been a chequered one. We can only refer to it here; but more detailed information is easily accessible in the interesting account of "Ferney in Voltaire's Time, and Ferney To-day," offered in the January number of the *Sunday Magazine*. The village had shared in the general desolation of the Pays de Gex, in the time of the Huguenot persecution; and it remained for long a wretched hamlet, inhabited only by a few poverty-stricken peasants. Then a strange restorer appeared in the person of Voltaire, whose wealth and administrative tact soon wrought a marvellous change on the aspect of the place. He began by building a château for himself; and then, after attracting a flourishing population, he reared a chapel for them, which he consecrated and inscribed to God, as a sort of deistic monument.

It will readily be believed that the introduction of Christianity was no part of Voltaire's plan of paternal, humanitarian policy in Ferney. But within a stone's-cast of his château, a modest Protestant church and manse now rise, which radiate a progressive evangelical influence over the whole surrounding district. The church was built in 1825; but it is only within the past twenty years that noteworthy progress has been made, through the truly apostolic energy and faith of the Reformed pastor, M. Pasquet. This honoured servant of God has not only established orphan asylums, libraries, and various useful institutions in Ferney itself, but with the help of friends has succeeded in providing eight neighbouring stations with churches and schools, and the necessary equipments, and in further leavening the district with the truth by means of colportage. The work has been blessed of God, and has a claim on the sympathy of the Christian world. The whole machinery is under M. Pasquet's superintendence, and the entire annual outlay of more than £2000 sterling has to be provided by or through himself. He has, in the face of untold embarrassments, succeeded in gathering "the scattered atoms of Protestantism which survive the persecution of centuries," and in showing, "under the very shadow of Voltaire's château, the mighty power of the faith of Christ." We cannot stay to relate the details of the work, or to particularise the interesting cases which have emerged in connection with it.

Regarding the new Reformed church at Troissy, we are indebted for information to the narrative of M. Briét, recently translated into English, and published in

pamphlet form. It is another instance of a fair Protestant village, wrested long ago from Huguenot influence by the brute force of the Guise persecution, being recently restored to Protestantism by the simple power of the Gospel of grace.

The narrative dates no further back than 1872, when three of the leading inhabitants, seeking refuge from clericalism and its consequent abuses, went to Monneaux to inquire at the pastor there about the principles of the Protestant religion. They found more than they sought, for the matter did not rest with mere temporal benefit to their village. A Protestant deputation was sent to Troissy. At first the members of it were scrutinised with curious eyes, and eagerly questioned by the villagers. Then one week later a meeting was held by M. Tintelin, the pastor of Monneaux, in a large courtyard. The ash-heap furnished the most primitive of pulpits, whence, almost under the windows of the priests and nuns of the place, the simple message of salvation was proclaimed with moving effect to a crowd numbering upwards of 200. The work gradually developed till it embraced Bouquigny and other villages. An evangelist was appointed; a girls' school established; and the Troissy congregation was formally attached to the Church of Reims and the Consistoire of Sedan. May the whole of this interesting, and to Frenchmen painfully historic region be led by God's blessing to make that surrender to Christ which implies not the shame of defeat, but the victory of faith! That faith has been needed by the adherents of the Reformed movement might be evinced by recounting the opposition they have had to encounter. It was not till 1877 that M. Jules Simon gave the authoritative permission to meet which the Troissy brethren had craved five years before. Since then the church has been opened, and has witnessed regular service from Sabbath to Sabbath. And the erection by its side of a manse and school is giving further ocular demonstration of the stability of the whole movement.

With cases like those of Ferney and Troissy before him, no one has a right to despair of the religious future of France. Many are seeking God in the land; and in notable instances He is being found, even of those who seek Him not.

C. A. S.

UNITED STATES.

By Rev. Dr. MATHEWS.

WE regret to find that our colleges are reporting a considerable falling off in the number of candidates for the ministry. Several reasons are offered in explanation, such as, the raising of the standard of qualification, insufficient support, and a widespread belief that there are at present more ministers in the field than can find work. There is a measure of truth in each of these statements, and all combined show that the position of the ministry in this country is undergoing a great change. Formerly, when society was only consolidating, earnestness and self-denying activity were considered the prime requisites for a pastor. The standard of general education being low, a ministry only partially educated according to modern ideas was greatly in advance of the people, and could be of service. The standard of popular education has however risen, so that our people ask, and ask rightfully, for thorough religious instruction. They want their ministers to be able to deal with such questions as are handled by the infidel—whether profanely by the coarse, or sneeringly by the more refined or pretentious. Some of them indeed ask for a ministry so highly educated, that each of its members shall be the equal of every specialist, whatever be his peculiar line.

Such a demand is unreasonable, and no Church would attempt to meet it. But the people have a right to find that their ministers have a knowledge of Present Day Questions, reasonable in amount and accurate in character, so that they can deal not only with sixteenth but with nineteenth century hearts and consciences. The effort of the Church to meet this demand is timely, and any weeding out or thinning that may result will be for good.

If the first of these reasons raises the question as to the *rights* of the people, the

second brings before us *their duties*. The average income of an American minister is about 800 dollars a-year, a pretty moderate sum on which to live in these days, when policemen in New York get 1200 dollars a-year. Now the pastor's work is to form character in those under his charge. To be helpful in this, his connection with them must be continuous, if not permanent. To this end, he must be educated, and if educated, should be supported, and this not according to the scale of our fathers, but the scale of the present day. So far, therefore, as this reason goes, the question is one for the people. If these want such a ministry as they ask for, *what will they give for it?* Their failure, in many cases, to recognise the present cost of living, the impossibility of a minister, out of his income, making any provision for the wants of old age, and the absence of any such provision by the Church—these deter not a few from entering the ministry. In this matter, emphatically, the works of the people must go along with their prayers.

The third reason is partly true, we think, and partly otherwise. Minister and pastor are not interchangeable terms with us. Hence we have many ministers who are not pastors, and, otherwise engaged, do not intend to enter the pastorate. But neither, on the other hand, have we any special surplus of congregations. In many cases two, and even three, charges combine to obtain the services of a minister. In this matter, as in the number of the sexes, there is a pretty fair equality over all, though in special localities there may be some trifling disparity.

BRAZIL

Letter from Rev. GEO. W. CHAMBERLAIN.

S. PAULO, BRAZIL, S.A., 25th Nov., 1878.

In your capacity as Editor of *The Catholic Presbyterian* (for which information I am indebted to the *Monthly Record* of Sept. 2), I am bold to address you a few lines, certain that you will welcome a brief notice of the Brazilian branch of the genealogical tree of the widespread and ever-spreading Presbyterian tribe.

In the capacity of retiring moderator of the Presbytery of Rio de Janeiro, it fell to me to issue the following *chamada* :—

“São Paulo, 22 de Outubro de 1878.

“A reunião ordinária do Presbyterio de Rio de Janeiro terá lugar na cidade de São Paulo, na 6ª feira, dia 6 de Dezembro prox. futuro, as 7.30 horas da noite.

“GEORGE W. CHAMBERLAIN, Ministro.”

Accordingly we will gather on the 6th of next month, in pursuance of this call, in this “imperial city of St. Paul,” the founding of which dates from the 25th January, 1554, when the Jesuits erected their first cabin and said their first mass on this spot. Singularly enough, they chose a Presbyterian patron for their founding college, and it would seem that the undaunted spirit of that staunch presbyter Paul could hardly withstand the provocation, for there shortly appeared in these regions, in the summer of 1560 (date memorable in Scottish Presbyterianism), a presbyter from Geneva, said to have been ordained by Calvin and others to be the bearer of the Gospel to this land. Rev. Dr. William Adams, of New York, told me that he had somewhere read that Calvin himself contemplated following him to establish here a refuge for our oppressed brethren of that age. But even here the hand red with the blood of the saints found them. Our Presbytery of Rio de Janeiro covers the ground which was trodden three centuries ago by the first Presbyterian martyr of the New Continent. Beginning his course where the city of Rio de Janeiro now stands, he came down the coast to the first Portuguese colony at S. Vicente, in this province, where single-handed, he coped so successfully with the Jesuits “that his heresy spread, despite all their efforts,” and they sent him to Bahia a prisoner, in 1560, thence to be brought in chains in 1567, and hung in Rio de Janeiro by the hand of the chief of the Jesuitical order, Jose de Anchietta. Pastors of Presbyterian churches in Bahia, Rio, and this province of São Paulo will in a few days honour his memory, and

by their very gathering in this province, where he was first seized, will witness to the faithfulness of our covenant God, to whom "a thousand years are as one day," and who is not "slack concerning His promises."

We are indeed feeble-handed in the face of the hoary walls of Rome in this land, and need the sympathy of the whole family.—Faithfully yours in the patience and kingdom of Jesus Christ,
GEO. W. CHAMBERLAIN.

SOUTHERN COLONIES.

VISITS FROM MINISTERS.

THE course of post occupies so long a time between Great Britain and her Colonies on the other side of the world, that we wish our readers there and elsewhere to understand that the want of communications from that quarter is due to that cause alone. Nowhere, we believe, is there a warmer feeling towards the Presbyterian Alliance, and for our part we can say very cordially that to no section of the Presbyterian Church is there a warmer feeling on our part. In the absence of special communications, we take the opportunity of laying before our readers the following extract from the letter of a friend, occupying an important colonial position:—

"Dr. Somerville's Visit.—It is not necessary that I should go into an elaborate account of his work in the Colonies. Abundant information will go home from other quarters. I would just say that on the whole his mission has been an eminent blessing to the Churches of Christ in these Colonies. His geniality and enthusiasm and freshness have delighted and encouraged us all greatly. Of course he has had to run the gauntlet of a free criticism, exceptions especially being taken to his somewhat dramatic style of oratory. For my part, I have no fault to find; on the contrary, I am full of thankfulness for the undoubted blessing that has attended his work in this place.

"But what I wished to say was this. It will now tend to grow into a custom for so-called evangelists to peregrinate over the face of the earth. This may become a positive evil, and we already have had samples of the objectionable kind of thing that I have in my eye. On the other hand, if kept under due control the occasional visit of an evangelist minister would be one of the most blessed things that could happen to us. And what I thought of was, to urge one with the influence you have to bring this matter in the proper way before the Churches at home, and get them to induce some of their very best men to do just what Dr. Somerville has done. He himself frequently said in private that he found it to be of immense advantage to be the accredited minister of a Church. It was of as much advantage to us as to him. We knew at once what and who he was, and how to stand affected towards him. But by-and-by — will make his appearance, and we have already had members of the Plymouth fraternity thrusting themselves upon us. The ease with which these men move round the world will make the thing propagate itself, and there will be no end of it. But send us one of your ministers, fully accredited from and to the Churches; a wise man, and awfully earnest, and with a measure of versatility, and a faculty of adapting himself to circumstances, and we will do him good, and he will do us good, and he will go back and the good will wait on you at home. There will be no difficulty about the money. Send us the right man, and we will spare no expense. Dr. Somerville's visit during the fortnight cost us £270, and the committee had the whole of the money, and £10 more, sent in within a week of the close of the mission."

WORK OF THE COUNCIL.

COMMITTEE ON STATISTICS.

THE statistics of Presbyterian Churches presented to the Council in 1877, and published in their Proceedings, were necessarily rough, and a committee was appointed to gather more complete statistics against the meeting in 1880. The convener (Professor Blaikie) having had many other duties connected with the Council, has not till now had it in his power to move in the matter. Besides, the committee is one that cannot be brought together, and the work must be done by correspondence, and through this Journal.

In connection with the same object, a Conference of members of various British Churches was lately held in Edinburgh, to consider in what manner uniform and trustworthy statistics might be obtained. That Conference agreed on some general propositions, and laid the basis of a schedule of details, which was to be revised by a sub-committee, and has not yet been finally adjusted.

The Conference, *inter alia*, agreed to the following resolution:—

"That it be recommended to the Statistical Committee of the Presbyterian Council to urge on the Churches associated with them the advantage of a regular and annual collection of congregational and synodical statistics, including, as far as possible, the same items as those suggested by this Conference for the Presbyterian Churches of the United Kingdom, especially statistics of communicants, office-bearers, congregational income from the congregation and other sources, Sabbath and day schools."

As soon as the Conference schedule is adjusted, a communication will be sent to the members of the committee, who are as follows:—Revs. Dr. Fisch, M. Charbonnier, Professor Brummelkamp, Dr. Edmond, Dr. Phin, Dr. Jeffrey, J. H. Orr, Dr. G. D. Mathews, Dr. W. Brown, Principal Caven, Dr. R. S. Scott, A. J. Campbell, *Ministers*; Messrs. J. A. Campbell, LL.D., of Stracathro, D. MacLagan, and James Croil, *Elders*.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE.

DOES HUMANITY REQUIRE A NEW REVELATION ?

(*Professor Tait's Reply to Mr. Froude in the "International Review."*)

THERE is in these days much loose talk, and equally loose writing, about the alleged incompatibility of Religion and Science. Discussion has tended more and more obviously to show that there is no real conflict between the two. We attach considerable weight, in this connection, to a striking paper contributed to a recent number of the *International Review*, by Prof. P. G. Tait, of Edinburgh University, whose acknowledged eminence in the scientific field, combined with an equally essential sympathetic regard for theological truth, gives the greatest weight to his testimony regarding the important matter of which he treats. The paper is entitled "Does Humanity require a New Revelation?" a question which it answers with a prompt and decided—No! The subjoined digest of the argument in favour of this conclusion may not be unwelcome to our readers.

The immediate occasion of Professor Tait's article is found in Mr. Froude's previous contributions to the same Review, entitled "Science and Theology—Ancient and Modern," in which he seems, like Lessing in his "Erziehung des Menschen Geschlechtes," to regard Christianity as only one important onward wave in the tide of civilisation.

Professor Tait begins by a forcible indictment of Mr. Froude's position, that "*what is generally doubted is doubtful.*" The charming dogmatism of the great historian, he contends, might as well be directed to maintain the paradox, that "*what is generally misunderstood is unintelligible.*" But that the latter position will not hold good is abundantly shown by Mr. Froude's own misconception, for instance, of the perfectly intelligible principle of the conservation of energy, and by the "tangled mass of error" which he presents in a single short paragraph on the cosmogony of Lucretius. Or would Mr. Froude maintain that "*he who is generally trusted is trustworthy*"? It needs no great historian to tell any of us in these times, that this is palpably false.

Then, after a brief allusion to certain slight etymological foundations on which Mr. Froude builds a large superstructure, in seeking to determine what is truth, the article proceeds to deal with what remains of his "slashing but melancholy argument."

A passage is quoted in which Mr. Froude affirms that "advanced scientific thinkers" have abandoned, among other things, the position that nature evidences a designing mind; and another passage in which he asserts that Lucretius "anticipated many of the generalisations of the best modern scientific thinkers," by the exercise of "the strictest scientific method." It is here pointed out that Lucretius's method was anything but "strictly scientific;" and the question is pertinently asked, who these "best," "ablest," "advanced" scientific thinkers may be, to whom Mr. Froude makes such confident appeal? The immediate past offers no greater scientific names than Brewster, Faraday, Forbes, Graham, Rowan Hamilton, Herschel, and Talbot. Still happily alive among us are men like Andrews, Joule, Clerk-Maxwell, Balfour Stewart, Stokes, William Thomson (and, we would add, Professor Tait himself). From which of all these does Mr. Froude find the least support for his rash assertion, that the idea is abandoned of nature giving evidence of a designing mind? Or where does he find the slenderest scientific basis for the hasty conclusion, that there are not now any direct interferences from without in what is called the order of nature? Something more than daring assertion is surely needed to support affirmations like these:—"The clergy and the archbishop are aware all the time that the evils which they pray against depend on natural causes, and that a prayer from a Christian minister will as little bring a change of weather as the incantation of a Caffre rain-maker. We keep to conventional forms, because none of us likes to acknowledge what we all know to be true; but we do not believe; we do not even believe that we believe, the bishops themselves no more than the rest of us—no more than the College of Augurs in Cato's time believed in the sacred chickens." Mr. Froude should here be content to speak for himself, without involving "the rest of us" in his baseless and godless generalisations.

For true scientific writing, three things are justly held to be requisite—*facts, logical reasoning, and knowledge in all respects adequate*. From the analogous cases of Brougham, the once celebrated "Vestiges of Creation," and the abundant paper science of the day, it is amply shown how easily a confident superficiality manages to gull a credulous public. And it is more than hinted that while he ranks far above the chorus of busy and ambitious chatterers, who, in the name of science, seek to enhance their own reputation at the expense of commonly-received religious doctrine, Mr. Froude would have done well to have shunned such unworthy company, instead of "throwing himself unsolicited, and in great part unqualified, into this sham fight of underlings."

The interests of true religion and true science are not really affected in the slightest by the fussy conflicts of supernumeraries or camp followers on either side, though these "go at it hammer and tongs, with plenty of noise and no result"—"like the terrific sword and buckler combat in a melodrama, cheered to the echo, though every one *knows* it is humbug."

The enormous exaggerations of Mr. Froude's picture of modern "advance" in shaking off the trammels of a burdensome superstition are next clearly exposed. "Theologians," he says, "no longer speak with authority. They are content to suggest. Those who doubted before now openly deny. Those who uphold orthodoxy cannot agree on what ground to defend it. . . . Along the whole line the defending forces are falling back, not knowing where to make a stand; and materialism all over Europe stands frankly out, and is respectfully listened to when it affirms that the war is over, that the claims of revelation can not be maintained, and that the existence of God and of a future state, the origin of man, the nature of conscience, and the meaning of the distinctions between good and evil, are all open questions."

But, as Professor Tait urges, the flippant lectures of half-educated materialists, and the childish follies of ritualism are not safe criteria in judging of the real religious convictions of a sound-hearted people, which, just because it is loyal to religion, does not parade it ostentatiously. They are but the froth rippling on

the surface, "while the strong current of common sense, morality, and religion flows on uninterruptedly below."

Mr. Froude's hint that Christianity is effete, and that an altogether new revelation, or at least a completely new system of philosophic belief is necessary, calls forth a powerful rejoinder from his critic. Admitting that the Christian revelation was long in being at all adequately understood, Professor Tait finds an analogy for this tardiness of comprehension in the case of the Creator's revelation of Himself in the book of nature, which we are even now only, as it were, *beginning* to comprehend. But Christianity, in spite of Mr. Froude's innuendo, is a spiritual creed, which men can and do "act on in their lives, and believe with their whole souls." Before he can succeed in getting men to relinquish Christianity, Mr. Froude must bring forward something better than a mere philosophic system, however erudite. For "the only religion which can have a rational claim on our belief must be one suited equally to the admitted necessities of the peasant and of the philosopher."

Such is an outline of Professor Tait's refutation of an ill-advised assault on Christianity, to which Mr. Froude's high and deserved literary reputation lends its chief element of danger. It is matter of congratulation that the distinguished historian's vagaries have at least landed him in the strong, safe grip of the no less distinguished natural philosopher; and, in general, it is well that we have among us scientific men who can pen such a passage as the following—"While almost all other religious creeds involve an outer sense for the uneducated masses and an inner sense for the more learned and therefore dominant priesthood, the system of Christianity appeals alike to the belief of all; requiring of all that, in presence of their common Father, they should sink their fancied superiority one over another, and frankly confessing the absolute unworthiness *which they cannot but feel*, approach their Redeemer with the simplicity and confidence of little children."

C. A. S.

OPEN COUNCIL AND CORRESPONDENCE.

CHURCH MATTERS IN SCOTLAND.

By an ENGLISH CLERGYMAN.

I HAVE just been visiting "Samaria"—the name by which extreme high churchmen sometimes designate Scotland. The question arises—Whence the justice or the accuracy of the name? Our English Church defines "the visible Church of Christ" to be "a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same" (Art. 19). This, I consider, applies to the Church of Scotland as well as the Church of England, and affords no ground for the idea of those who would speak as though the Mercy-seat—the only place of acceptance—were to be found beneath the shadow of Episcopacy, to the exclusion of Presbyterianism. While I believe that Episcopacy, if faithfully carried out, has its great advantages, I delight to look upon the Presbyterian Church of Scotland as the true sister of the English Church in that country; rather differently attired, it may be, but bearing a strong family resemblance to her. And when I hear it said that "the Church" (by which is meant the Scotch Episcopal Church) "is making great progress in Scotland," I rejoice to know that the Church of Christ includes many in that country who, while professing another form of church government, are one with England in her Protestantism.

Extemporary prayer (or, perhaps, to speak more correctly, the absence of a liturgy) is a feature comparatively new to the English churchman; how far the prayers offered in the Church are really "extemporary," or uttered without

previous study or preparation, may depend upon circumstances. A really candid, unbigoted mind will be ready to admit that the custom of years may have much to do with the preference, one way or the other. As an English clergyman, attached to the Church of his country, I do love our old Liturgy; besides which, we have there a form of prayer and thanksgiving, drawn up by men well versed in Scripture, and deeply acquainted with the wants of human nature,—prayers, too, many of which have come down to us from bygone ages. But, at the same time, I have often enjoyed, and I hope have been benefited by, the worship of the Scotch Church; and I may mention one particular Sunday, when I felt the contrast greatly between the fervently-uttered prayers in the Presbyterian church and the rapidly-intoned liturgy at the Scotch Episcopal Church. Our form of worship was there, to which I had been accustomed from childhood; but the beauty of it was “eaten as with a canker;” while, again, on the previous Sunday, the liturgy was read elsewhere in such a manner as to help the devotion of the congregation. This was one thought that struck me while in Scotland—that if the same fervour were thrown into our Liturgy, which I frequently heard in the prayers of the Kirk, we might expect a much greater blessing on the congregation. One great difference between our Church and that of Scotland is this—the Church of England has a fixed selection of Scripture for every Sunday; the Scotch Church leaves the selection (so far as I know) entirely to the minister. I once said to a Scotch minister,—the late Dr. Lumsden, of Aberdeen,—with whom I had some pleasant intercourse, “I suppose it is the minister’s object, in his selection of Scripture, the hymns, and the prayers, to fix some leading idea in the people’s minds,”—to which he replied, “It ought to be so.” This remark—while it confirmed my idea of how much was left to the discretion of the individual minister—suggested the thought, that that system, if properly carried out, has its advantages. It has often been said that the Scotch are a thoughtful people, and I am sure that those who should attend such a service with any desire for edification must be greatly trained to habits of thought by this weekly endeavour to learn the leading truth which a faithful minister would seek to fix in their minds. And, while speaking of so much being left to the individual minister, I reflect that the Church of Scotland has long devoted special attention to the training of young men for the ministry, and that great care is taken not to ordain men who are not thought equal to the work required of them; and further, I would not for one moment forget (what is needful, whether with a liturgy or without one) that the Holy Spirit’s help is promised to all who seek it for the work to which He calls them.

We must look for, and expect, imperfection in every human system. Some who talk very loudly about “the Union of Christendom” would exclude from it all who do not acknowledge Episcopacy; while some, perhaps, in their aversion to “Prelacy,” would be almost as exclusive in an opposite direction. As I have much respect for the late Dr. Macleod, I would conclude these few notes with his words, taken from “Reminiscences of a Highland Parish”: “Acquaintance with other branches of the Christian Church, a knowledge of living men, and the spirit with which the truly good serve God according to the custom of their fathers; dealing, too, with the realities of human life, and Christian experience, rather than with the ideal of what might, could, would, or should be, will tend to make us charitable in our judgment of those who receive good, and express their love to God, through outward forms very different from our own. Let us endeavour to penetrate beneath the variable, the temporary, and accidental, to the unchangeable, the eternal, and necessary; and then we shall bless God when among ‘different communions’ we can discover earnest believing souls who have communion with the same living Saviour, who receive with faith and love the same precious sacrifice to be their life.”

W.

OUR DEVOTIONAL SERVICES.

IN the "Colloquia Peripatetica" of the late Professor John Duncan, the following passage occurs in reference to liturgies:—

"In forgetting our Directory, we are too little liturgical; and if the Church were very spiritual, it would need no liturgy. We have far too many preaching prayers; many good ministers preach to God. The best of our forefathers were more anti-Erastian than anti-episcopal, and more opposed to a bad liturgy than anti-liturgic. I do not wonder that the desire for forms of prayer is returning. I could say nothing against the use of a liturgy, as a catholic question, for all the Churches; but I am definite against confinement to it: but as for us in Scotland, I am opposed to it in any form at present. But a good liturgy forms a fine common bond for the Churches. I remember, when at Leghorn, hearing a very painful sermon from the Bishop of —; and on leaving the church a friend remarked, 'I'm thankful he can't spoil the prayers'" (Pp. 32, 33).

The attempt of Laud to force his liturgy on Scotland complicated the whole question of liturgical forms, which undoubtedly in Knox's time was not foreclosed. Would it be possible, at any meeting of the General Council or otherwise, to ascertain how the case stands, and has stood throughout all Presbyterian Churches—1st, As a matter of fact; and 2nd, As a matter of principle? Certain it is that there are few more important questions for us than the best mode of conducting the public devotional services, and that there is nothing that would tend more to give *completeness* to Presbyterian service than a practical solution of this question.

E. I. O.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

NOTES.

DUTCH TRANSLATORS AND BRITISH AUTHORS.—"The History of Protestantism," by Dr. Wylie, published by the Messrs. Cassell, of London, has been translated into Dutch, and is in course of publication by Kraig Brothers, Amsterdam. A review of the work appeared in a recent number of the *Paedagogische Bijdragen*, and we append an extract from that review for a reason that will immediately appear. The translator, *Dr. Hofstede de Groot*, has, the reviewer tells us, interpolated and corrupted the text of Dr. Wylie's history, so as to make it the vehicle of diffusing throughout Holland, and Dutch-speaking countries, opinions and principles the opposite, in many instances, of those which the work was written to maintain. The translator was at perfect liberty to dissent from his author as often, and to any extent he judged right and necessary; but we submit he ought to have put such dissent into footnotes, not into the text, thereby metamorphosing the work, and changing its whole spirit and teaching.

The case appears to us, and we daresay our readers will agree with us, one of peculiar hardship. What remedy the author may have, or whether he has any, is not very clear. It will help so far to correct the evil, to make Dutch readers aware, as we now do, that there is a material difference on many points, not unimportant, betwixt the *Dutch translation* and the *English original*.

The reviewer says:—

"We call the special attention of our readers to the work announced at the head of this paper. A Dutch translation has appeared at Amsterdam, published by Kraig Brothers. In the *Voices of Truth and Peace* there was given, last year, a specimen of this Dutch work, from the life of Luther. At this time *Dr. Hofstede de Groot* was still engaged on his first part, in which instead of a number of Wylie's chapters there were substituted fragments from Ranke, or passages written by his own hand. In the remaining portions, as he announces, he will still be obliged repeatedly to differ from Wylie. Indeed, in Part II., which treats of the Reformation in France and Geneva, and thus also specially of Calvin, he has done this to so large an extent, that *Dr. Wylie*, reading the Dutch work, if he did not see his name on the title-page and copies of the original plates between the

letterpress, would not certainly be likely to imagine that the work had been published under his name. . . . Though the writer declares that 'production of proof' and 'refutation of others,' will not be found in his book at all, yet the well-known tendency of the translator comes out in nearly every chapter of Part II., and he does not long keep strictly faithful to his programme. In the judgment he forms regarding persons, Mr. Hofstede de Groot is sometimes diametrically opposed to Dr. Wylie. . . . Moreover, Dr. Hofstede de Groot summarily sets down, as legends, a number of facts, given by Merle D'Aubigné and also by Dr. Wylie from the first portion of Calvin's life, though these facts, in other respects, have nothing more improbable or marvellous than, for instance, the events of Luther's life.

"We leave it to specialists to say more about this matter. . . . It would be desirable that one of our publishers should, some time, see to giving us a real translation of Wylie's work, though it were only of the history of the Reformation in France and Geneva. Such a translation would have a complete *raison d'être*, even after the appearance of the work of Dr. Hofstede de Groot."

MR. BROWNLOW NORTH ON PRESBYTERIANISM.—When Mr. Brownlow North was recognised as an evangelist by the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, he addressed some observations to the Assembly, in the course of which he said:—

"I do not believe that there is a more effective system in Christendom for the promotion of the true religion than the Presbyterian system *if it was carried out*. But the machinery is not worked. Look at the mass of elders there are in the Presbyterian Church. But what are these elders doing as a body? Blessed be God, there are many holy, self-denying, godly men, who seek not their own things but the things which are Jesus Christ's, and who go into the lanes and alleys of the cities, and pray and speak and try to lead people to God. But do the elders, *as a body*, do that? How many elders are there in Edinburgh? Say there are a thousand. If these thousand elders would go forth and try to promote the glory of Jesus Christ and the good of souls, what salt, light, and heaven might they be to the whole community? But I believe there are elders—it is possible there may be such in this very Assembly—who know that God who searcheth their hearts, sees that from week to week, and from month to month, they never make a single attempt to do anything for the glory of Jesus Christ, and such must give an account to God at the last day."—*Life*, by Moody-Stuart, pages 161, 162.

QUERIES.

[2] ENGLISH EDITION OF CALVIN'S LETTERS.—In the English translation of the "Letters of John Calvin, by Dr. Jules Bonnet," published by Thomas Constable & Co., of Edinburgh, in 1855, it is said at the end of the Preface, p. xiv., that "The English edition of Calvin's collected correspondence will form *four volumes* similar to the present, and will contain at least 600 letters, the greater part of which are now published for the first time." Of this publication I have never seen more than *two* volumes. I would like to know—

1. Were more than two volumes of this edition published?
2. If not, why is it that the remainder of the work does not appear?

These letters, I need scarcely add, tell the life of Calvin in the most authentic form, and the side-light which they cast on the political and religious history of Europe in the sixteenth century is most valuable and interesting. Z.

ANSWER.

[1] ELIZABETH OF BOHEMIA.—An excellent Memoir of Elizabeth of Bohemia was published some years ago. I read it to the inmates of the Female Blind Asylum, *who asked for it*. It is entitled "Life and Correspondence of the Princess of Bohemia. By Madame Blaze de Bury." Bentley, 1853. J. R. D.,

George Square, Edinburgh.

Your correspondent D. T. R. had better read the life of the Princess Elizabeth in Mrs. Everett Green's "Princesses of England."

S. R. G.,
4 Gordon Street, W.C.

MEMORIAL TRIBUTES.

REV. DR. BEADLE, OF PHILADELPHIA.

IN a postscript to the number of this Journal for February, we expressed our deep sympathy with our American brethren, on occasion of the sudden death of Dr. Beadle. Dr. Beadle was one of the promoters of the Presbyterian Alliance, an active and honoured member of the Council of 1877, and chairman of the business committee appointed to prepare for the meeting of Council at Philadelphia next year. On the first Sabbath of the year he preached to his own congregation, and congratulated them on the removal of the heavy debt which the building of their new church had entailed; but on his way home the ice blast struck him with such force as to bring on an attack of *angina pectoris*, to which in a few hours he succumbed.

Dr. Beadle was born in 1810, and the first part of his active life was spent as a missionary in Syria, under the direction of the American Board of Missions. Obligated by the state of his health to return to the United States, he exercised his ministry in various places with great efficiency, and finally became pastor of the second Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia. Dr. Beadle was greatly beloved and esteemed. Devoted to his work as a minister, he was at the same time an ardent student of natural history, especially in the departments of conchology and mineralogy; he was one of those rare men, in short, in whom piety, learning, and science are found in happy combination.

Dr. Beadle was preparing to throw his whole energies into the work of preparation for the Philadelphia meeting of the Council. His Master has accepted his heart-willingness in room of actual service.

In addition to Dr. Beadle, three other members of the General Committee for preparing for the Philadelphia meeting have been removed by death—Mr. Morris Patterson, an active and influential elder in Philadelphia; Rev. W. C. Jackson, of the United Presbyterian Church; and Mr. Henry B. Webster, of Nova Scotia.

PROFESSOR BONIFAS, OF MONTAUBAN.

WE desire, at the same time, to show our condolence with the Reformed Church of France, in the sudden and premature removal, at the age of forty-one, of M. François Bonifas, Professor of Church History in the Protestant Theological Faculty of Montauban. The bereavement is a peculiarly severe one. The son of one professor, and the brother of another, M. Bonifas was reared in an academical atmosphere, and from the first evinced remarkable talents. Called to a professor's chair at the age of twenty-nine, he amply justified the trust reposed in him; an ardent and whole-hearted believer; devoted in such a degree to the will of God as his rule of life, that his colleague, M. Jean Monod, could say of him, more than of any man he knew—"Il est tout conscience;" actively interested in science and literature; an admirable professor, beloved and honoured by the students; withal modest and gentle; his early removal is mourned by his brethren with unusually bitter grief. Yet nothing could have been more simple and serene than his departure, uttering as his last testimony the words—"Whether we die, we die in the Lord;" and expressing the last emotion of his spirit—"How beautiful is heaven! And how near!" Many will echo the prayer that his example may prove a great power to his students, and that very many may be raised up to follow in his steps.

A French correspondent writes us that it is impossible to convey to strangers a due impression of the loss sustained in the death of M. Bonifas.

DR. MARTINUS COHEN STUART, OF UTRECHT.

OUR friends in Holland have likewise sustained a bereavement in the death of Dr. Stuart, a theologian and writer of high eminence, and an earnest friend of evangelical union. He was present as an associate at the Edinburgh Council, and both in private and public won the high regard of many friends.

REV. PROFESSOR SMYTH, D.D., OF LONDONDERRY.

WE take the opportunity, though late, to assure our Irish brethren of the profound regret with which all sections of the Church heard of their bereavement, when Professor Smyth was removed so suddenly and unexpectedly. Distinguished alike for services rendered to the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, and in the House of Commons, where he represented the County of Derry, by his invaluable advocacy and skilful piloting of the Sunday Closing Bill, Professor Smyth occupied an unusually prominent and influential position; he seemed to be destined for a long career of usefulness; and his early removal, in the prime of life, was a most distressing bereavement.

REV. WILLIAM THOMAS AND REV. DR. CHARLES, OF WALES.

THE Church of Wales has also had its trials. Two prominent ministers of the Connexion have been taken to their rest during the last few weeks. The first was the Rev. William Thomas, of Batell, Monmouthshire, who died on the 20th November, at the early age of forty-six. He was a most melting preacher—stirring the hearer to the very depths of his soul. The writer has not the fountain of tears very near the surface, and yet he never remembers hearing Mr. Thomas preach without being constrained to weep. But it was by his bardic name, “Islwyn,” that he was best known throughout Wales, and in all places where the Welsh language is read or spoken. All who understand poetry, and all who profess to understand it, agree in placing him very high in the foremost rank of the poets of Wales.

The other is the Rev. D. Charles, D.D., of Aberdovey. He was grandson to the renowned Mr. Charles, of Bala, and was for many years deservedly eminent on his own account. He was a graduate of the University of Oxford, and was elected Fellow of the Royal Geological Society. Soon after he left the University he was appointed President of Trevecca College, a position which he occupied with great efficiency for twenty years. Having removed to Aberystwyth, he threw himself heart and soul into the effort to establish a University College for Wales in that town, and it is to his untiring energy that the success of that undertaking is largely due. The college has been open for some years under the presidency of his nephew, the Rev. T. Charles Edwards, M.A. Dr. Charles contributed largely to Welsh literature, and was in every respect an able minister of the New Testament. He died suddenly on the morning of the 13th December,—less than two days after the Bala Association had elected him Synodical Examiner for the next three years.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

WE have still to express our regret that the whole of the Churches of the Presbyterian Council are not yet represented in these pages. We have been unaccountably disappointed of some letters which we had good reason to expect. The United States do not present their due proportion of contributions in this number. Ships from Canada freighted with articles seem to sail very slowly. The Antipodes, of course, have not yet had time to communicate with us. But by-and-by, we trust, all these things will be made right.

We wish to let it be known that through “Open Council,” we are prepared to ventilate various shades of opinion, falling of course within the consensus of the Reformed Churches, duly authenticated (to ourselves at least) by the names of the writers. We do not wish to be one-sided, and through this channel we desire to supplement any views or statements to which it may be thought by competent writers that that objection applies.

We are making arrangements for a series of papers, in early numbers, in which information will be given respecting the views and practice of various communities on subjects of practical interest connected with the worship and the work of the Church.

EDITOR.